



MALMÖ UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF CULTURE
AND SOCIETY

Exploring Organizational Motives and Challenges in Cross-Sector- Social Partnerships Project: A Case of Tillväxt Malmö Project

Ayupry Diptasari
Riem Kayed
Yoonah Know

Main Field of Study – Leadership and Organization
Degree of Master of Arts (60 credits) with a Major in Leadership and Organisation
Master Thesis with a focus on Leadership and Organization for Sustainability (OL646E),
15 credits Summer 2018
Supervisor: Jonas Lundsten

Acknowledgements

"The most complete give of God is a life based on knowledge"

-Ali Ibn Abu Talib-

"..And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

-John 8:32 King James Version (KJV)-

First of all, we would like to thank God for all of the blessings that has been given to us so we could finish this master thesis.

Secondly, we would like to thank our supervisor Jonas Lundsten for all of his advices and valuable feedback during the process.

Thirdly, we would like to thank to the Uppstart Malmö, particularly Åsa Krug and also our beloved teacher Fredrick Björk who has been given us valuable inputs and information in regards Tillväxt Malmö project.

Also, we would like to thank to all of interview participants for their time to share their information, knowledge, and experiences.

Last but not least, we would like to thank our beloved families, husbands, son, daughter, and parents that has always been providing us with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout the year of master study and through the process of accomplishing this master thesis.

Ayupry Diptasari, Know-Yoonah, and Riem Kayed

Lund - Malmö - Helsingborg, 23th of August 2018

Abstract

The project is based on cross-sector partnerships to address societal problems (CSSP's). CSSP's are increasingly needed to address sustainability around the world. Previous studies on partnerships literature mostly investigated the organizational motives and key success factors. Regarding organizational motives, many studies investigated the motives of the organization to join partnerships in the context of dyadic partnerships such as non-profit and business partnerships. There is a need to investigate further the motives of the organization to join the social partnerships project with more than two sectors participated in the project. Meanwhile, the complexity of partnerships is increasing when more than three-sectors partnerships involved in the project. Some scholars also argued that cross-sector partnerships have a higher failure rate of partnerships rather than within sector partnerships.

Therefore, this study aims to explore organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project on a local level, and organizational challenges during implementation of it. A case study of Tillväxt Malmö project was chosen in this study as the project consists of more than three-sectors partnerships, which are a non-profit organization as the focal organization, and their partners are private sector (companies and investors), university and local governments.

This study found there are four themes of organizational motives, which are society, resources, legitimacy, and competency that emerges from empirical finding. Most of the motives that are mentioned by organizations who joined and participate in the Tillväxt Malmö project is to address societal issues, to promote positive change, to bring benefits and help the growth of local business in Malmö city, and to support the development of social incubator in Malmö. This study also discovered four types of challenges which are (1) the different and changing of organizational mission and objectives, (2) the different of language, logic and perspective, (3) the difficulty to make organizational to work together and see each other as equal, and (4) the lack of transparency. Furthermore, the study also found that organizational motive has an important role that determines the sustainability of partnerships, whereas the different organizational motive between the partners to participate in CSSPs project could present as a barrier that strains the relationships between the partners.

The paper illustrates the organizational motives and challenges in cross-sector social partnerships project which includes more than three-sectors in the domain to support the local economic development. Theoretically, this contributes to providing comprehensive literature about the motives and challenges in cross-sector social partnerships. In practical, it also gives an insight for project leaders or managers to address the relevant issues that face during implementation of cross-sector social partnerships project.

Keywords: sustainability, cross-sector social partnerships project, organizational motives, and organizational challenges.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background and problem formulation	1
1.1.1. The unemployment problem in Malmö city and the influences of unemployment problem to the society	2
1.1.2. The cross-sector social partnerships for sustainability	2
1.1.3. The introduction to the case of cross-sector social partnerships project: Tillväxt Malmö project	2
1.1.4. Research gap	3
1.2. Purpose of the study	4
1.3. Research questions	4
1.4. Scope of the study	4
1.5. Structure	4
2. Theoretical framework	5
2.1. The cross-sector social partnerships	5
2.1.1. Definitions of cross-sector social partnerships	5
2.2. The arena of cross-sector social partnerships	6
2.3. Organizational motives to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships	7
2.3.1. Legitimacy	7
2.3.1.1. The non-profit organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy	7
2.3.1.2. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy	8
2.3.1.3. The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy	8
2.3.2. Resources	9
2.3.2.1. The non-profit organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources	9

2.3.2.2. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources	9
2.3.2.3. The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources	9
2.3.2.4. The government motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources	9
2.3.3. Competency	9
2.3.3.1. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Competency	9
2.3.3.2. The NPO motives to join and participate CSSPs: Competency	9
2.3.4. Society	10
2.3.4.1. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society	11
2.3.4.2. The NPO motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society	11
2.3.4.3. The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society	11
2.3.4.4. The government motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society	11
2.4. Organizational challenges of cross-sector social partnerships	11
3. Methodology and method	15
3.1. Methodology	15
3.1.1. Ontological and epistemological ground	15
3.1.2. Abductory induction	15
3.2. Research methods	16
3.2.1. Data collection	16
3.2.1.1. Primary data: Semi-structure interview	16
3.2.1.2. Secondary data: documents	19
3.2.2. Data analysis	19
3.2.3. Reliability in research	21
3.3. Research ethics	21
4. Main finding and analysis	21
4.1. Organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs project	22
4.1.1. The non-profit organization	22
4.1.2. The local government municipality: Malmö Stad	24
4.1.3. The private sectors: the private business partner and private investors	25
4.1.3.1. Business partner: Alumni and Delphi company	25
4.1.3.2. Private investors	25
4.1.4. The university: Malmö university	26

4.2. Organizational challenges during implementation of CSSPs project	29
4.2.1. The difference and changing of organizational mission and objectives	29
4.2.2. The different of language, logic, and perspective	29
4.2.3. The difficulty to make the organizations to collaborate together and to see each other as equal	30
4.2.4. The lack of transparency	30
5. Discussion and conclusion	31
5.1. What are the organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project?	31
5.1.1. Society	31
5.1.2. Resources	32
5.1.3. Legitimacy	32
5.1.4. Competency	33
5.2. What are the organizational challenges in cross-sector social partnerships project?	34
5.2.1. The different and changing of organizational mission and objectives	34
5.2.2. The different of language, logic, and perspective	34
5.2.3. The difficulty to make organization collaborate each other and see each other as equal	34
5.2.4. The lack of transparency	35
5.3. The relations of organizational motives and challenges	36
5.4. Conclusion	36
5.4.1. Concluding remark	36
5.4.2. Contribution to theory and practice	38
5.4.2.1. Contribution to theory	38
5.4.2.2. Contribution to practice	39

5.4.3. Limitation and further research	39
5.4.3.1. Limitation of the study	39
5.4.3.2. Recommendation for further research	40
<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Appendix 1. Table 1</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Appendix 2. Interview guide</i>	<i>ix</i>

Table of Tables

Table 1. The Unemployment rate in Malmö city compare to the whole Sweden from 2008 to 2017	i
Table 2. Information of the interview respondents	18
Table 3. List of collected documents	19
Table 4. Example of interviews analysis process: starts with defining the code, categorization into category and themes	20
Table 5. Example of document analysis process: starts with defining the code categorization into category and themes	20
Table 6. The Summary of organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs project based on the interview and document analysis according to the themes that identify on the literature review of 'organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships'	28

Table of Figures

Picture 1. The form of cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs)	6
---	---

Table of Abbreviation

CSSPs	Cross-sector social partnerships
NPO	Non-profit organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and problem formulation

Malmö is Sweden's third-largest city with a population of nearly 320,000 with culturally diverse backgrounds. Located in the dynamic Öresund region, one of Europe's growth regions spanning Copenhagen, Malmö, Lund, Helsingborg, and Helsingør, it is nevertheless on recovering from industrial collapse in the late 80s to a brighter future. Malmö has undergone a tremendous change, not least in business over the last 20 years (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018; Malmöbusiness, 2016). According to OECD's data (2017), incomes in the city are below national average, and unemployment is relatively high. In particular, regarding employment by industry, there are few large employers today in Malmö, with the main ones being the hospital and the city authorities. With little manufacturing left in the city, a more diversified economy is gradually emerging, which is dominated by media, IT, service and some technical services. Many local people are employed in the service industry in Copenhagen and the biotech and IT industries in Lund. Despite this employment situation, the population of Malmö is still growing by about 5,000 people per year.

1.1.1 The unemployment problem in Malmö city and the influences of unemployment problem to the society

One of the main problems that Malmö city still face, is the unemployment rate that is quite high compared with other cities in Sweden. According to the Arbetsförmedlingen (a governmental job center in Sweden), the monthly statistics of the number of people of *öppet arbetslöshet* in Malmö city in December 2017 is 11695 persons (Arbetsförmedlingen, 2018), and It has reached approximately 14.7% in 2017, which is almost double the percentage of unemployment rate in Sweden in general in 2017 witch was around 7.5% (Ekonomifakta, 2018). In Appendix 1, there is the table 1, shows the unemployment rate in Malmö city and compare it to Sweden in general from 2008 until 2017.

Furthermore, the Swedish welfare state is mostly funded by the taxes that are paid in the country, including the personal income taxes (Swank, 1998). To be able to provide the same services, it is essential to keep a steady income flow, hence the necessity for keeping the unemployment rate low. Moreover, unemployment could also lead to several different social and individual personal problems (Agerskov, 2015).

As individuals, we often define ourselves by our job position. Therefore, not having a job, could lead to a crisis in the process of defining their own identity. To solve this, individuals often tend to seek a group sharing the same values and has the same interests. It is a good thing to do, whenever the group has a positive influence. However, whenever a person has been unemployed for a long time, it becomes more difficult for them to get back into the workforce, and therefore the group often creates a negative perception of the society, and they will feel excluded, which will lead to an in/out-group experience. Moreover, the unemployed persons often feel like the rest of the society is stigmatizing them, so they prefer to live close to each other to feel comfortable (Leyens, et al., 2000).

As a result of that, some areas will be less attractive for many of the employed persons to move into, which will lead to an unbalanced city. Moreover, this could influence the children from

both the employed as well as the unemployed families, because they will lack on seeing different spectrums of the society and might also lack a role model to inspire them.

Above mentioned issues can be partly solved by helping the unemployed persons finding a job. It does not only help them as individuals but also it will help the society become more inclusive, as well as it will help the economic growth and lower a bit of the pressure on the supportive payments from the government (Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, & Diener, 2004).

Furthermore, referring to the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) number 8, it is essential to promote inclusive, sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work opportunity for everyone (United Nations, 2018). To solve this problem and to achieve sustainable development goal, we cannot only rely solely on one sector (such as the government's), as the public sector cannot manage to change and increasing demands of local community and market. Thus, it also needs more participation from the other sectors (such as private sectors and the third sector) to manage these 'social demand (BEPA, 2010).

Therefore, the interest and need for different organizations from different sectors to create and establish partnerships in the form of cross-sector social partnerships have been exponentially increasing since more than 15 years ago to address sustainability issues around the world (Gray & Stites, 2013).

1.1.2 The cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs) for sustainability

In this study, we will refer to the definition of cross-sector social partnerships by Selsky and Parker (2005, p.850), which is *“cross-sector projects formed explicitly to address social issues and causes that actively engage the partners on an ongoing basis.”* Moreover, the cross-sector social partnership is also necessary in order to tackle social problems and to achieve the outcomes that could create benefit for the community. It starts with the understanding that different sectors (such as, government, nonprofits and philanthropies, private company, the media, and the community) need to collaborate with each other to deal with the societal challenges effectively (Bryson et al., 2006). In the systematic literature review, Gray and Stites (2013), also mentioned that the cross-sector partnerships are needed to address sustainability globally.

Furthermore, according to Donaldson (2007, p. 141), *“the nonprofit sector makes an enormous contribution to society providing needed services to disadvantaged populations by offering vehicles for charitable and volunteer impulses . . . And serving as a moral compass for responses to social problems”*. For instance, in relations to address unemployment problems in Malmö, Sweden, such an initiative has been developed by a non-profit organization, which is Uppstart Malmö, in the form of cross-sector social partnership project, which is called Tillväxt Malmö project (Björk & Sjölander, 2014). The initiative has already made a positive contribution to the Malmö society. Since the establishment in 2011, it already able to help almost 200 companies to grow their business, create almost 1328 new job opportunities, and attract more than 25 million Swedish kronor of investment (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018).

1.1.3 The introduction to the case of cross-sector social partnerships project: Tillväxt Malmö project

The non-profit organization which is the Uppstart Malmö has complemented government functions as facilitating organizations to address the public problems. The Uppstart Malmö is a non-profit organization in the form of foundation that has been established since 2011 and has the vision to create Malmö to be a better city (Uppstart Malmö, 2018). The first idea was that through creating job opportunities, it can change the situation of the individual as well as the increasing

number employment in Malmö could contribute to reducing the segregation (Björk & Sjölander, 2014). Hence, one of the initiatives that created by Uppstart Malmö is Tillväxt Malmö project (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018).

We first examined that the Tillväxt Malmö project, a cross-sector social partnerships project that comprises from local government municipality which is *Näringslivkontoret* of Malmö Stad, a non-profit organization which is Uppstart Malmö, around 20 private businesses partners, several investors, and a university which is Malmö university (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018). The purpose of the Tillväxt Malmö project is to help the small and medium size companies which have approximately 5-25 employees to grow their business, to promote the job creation and improve economic growth in Malmö (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018). Based on the Tillväxt Malmö (2018), one of the alternative solutions to promote job creation in Malmö city is through helping the small-medium size company to grow their business. That is because most of the companies in Malmö city comprise of the small and medium size of enterprises that reach around 58% of the total number of companies in Malmö (Tillväxt Malmö, 2018). Through this initiative it will enable to help the companies to grow, for instance, to increase the number of their employees or their business, which means that it may create more job and improve the economic growth in Malmö city. The Tillväxt Malmö project has made its support structure in their partnership with other sectors as an instrument to achieve this purpose. This network has changed over time through mutual learning and reinforcing each other among its actors (Björk & Sjölander, 2014).

1.1.4 Research gap

According to Pennec and Raufflet (2018), most of the researchers on partnerships and collaborations focus on two main areas, which are the organizational motives for partnership and collaboration and key success factors. However, for the areas of organizational motives, many studies investigated on the organizational motives in the context Non-profit and Business partnership or collaborations (e.g., Austin, 2000; Rondinelli & London, 2003; Gray & Stites, 2013; Seitani, 2010; Yazidi & Doh, 2009). By these reasons, it gives the opportunity, to explore more on the organizational motives in the context of social partnerships project that involved more than two sectors that incorporated. According to Gray and Stites (2013), the motives of different partners to join partnerships are necessary to define, because it can lead to the difficulties during the process of partnerships if motivations are not being aligned between the partners. Furthermore, according to Jupp (2000), managing cross-sector partnership and collaboration is extremely challenging, because every domain has different circumstances and environments, so no one model can be applied to all domains (Jupp, 2000). Also, because of the high rate of failure of partnerships (Anderson & Jap, 2005; Mohr & Spekman, 1994). The previous studies have investigated the challenges of multiple-sector partnerships, such as a study by Babiak and Thibault (2009) that investigate about the organizational challenge in multi sector-partnerships that comprises from public, non-profit, and private sector in the domain of Canada's sport system. By this reason, it still gives the opportunity to explore the organizational challenges in the context of cross-sector social partnerships project when more than three sectors are participated which are public, non-profit, private sectors, and university, and in the domain to support the local businesses in Malmö to grow and to address the un-employment problem in Malmö city, Sweden.

Therefore, it gives the opportunity for the authors to explore more on the organizational motives to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships project, particularly in the context of when organization from multi-sectors such as, a non-profit organization, a local government municipality, private sectors, and a university, are being involved in the project. Also, the organizational challenges that face during the implementation of cross-sector social partnerships project.

1.2 Purpose of the study

Based on the background and problem formulation, therefore, the purpose of this study are :

To explore organizational motives to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships project and to investigate the organizational challenges during implementation of cross-sector social partnerships project, particularly in the case of Tillväxt Malmö project.

1.3 Research questions

To achieve the purpose of the study, the research questions of the study are:

1. What are the organizational motives to join and participate in the cross-sector social partnerships project?
2. What are the organizational challenges in cross-sector social partnerships project?

1.4 Scope of the study

The research is based on the selected cross-sector social partnership project in the local level, which is Tillväxt Malmö project, in the city of Malmö, Sweden. The cross-sector social partnership project consists of several organizations that comes from more than three different sectors. In our case it comprises from a non-profit organization which is Uppstart Malmö as focal organization that owns the project and manage the implementation of the Tillväxt Malmö project, and their partners, such as a the local government municipality which is *Näringslivkontoret* of Malmö Stad, private sectors (several private businesses partners and private investors), and a university which is Malmö University in Malmö, Sweden. Furthermore, the scope of this thesis is limited to the perspective of the respondents as the representatives of the organizations that involved in the cross-sector social partnership project.

1.5 Structure

The outline of the thesis presents into following chapters. The chapter 1, the introduction presents the background, the problem formulation, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the scope of the study and the structure of the study. Then, chapter 2 presents research theoretical background. Chapter 3 presents the methodology and method. Then, Chapter 4 describes the main finding and analysis of data that gathered from the research. Finally, in chapter 5 is the discussion and conclusion of the research.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter presents the theoretical background which is the foundation of this study. This chapter comprises of four sub-chapters, which are (1) the definition of cross-sector social partnerships, (2) the arena of cross-sector social partnerships, (3) the organizational motives to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships, and (4) the organizational challenges of cross-sector partnerships. The first and second sub-chapters aims to give the reader understanding about the concept of cross-sector social partnerships and the arena of CSSP. The third and fourth sub-chapters aim to review from literature about the organizational motives to join and participate in the cross-sector social partnerships and organizational challenges of cross-sector partnerships.

2.1 The cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs)

2.1.1 Definitions of cross-sector social partnerships

Various scholars have conducted research on networks, collaborations, inter-organizational collaborations, cross-sector partnerships, cross-sector social partnerships and cross-sector collaborations for more than a decade (e.g., Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Rondinelli & London, 2003; Gray & Stites, 2013). According to Gray and Stites (2013), in the literature, some definitions of partnerships and collaborations used interchangeably.

In this study, we will refer to the definition of cross-sector social partnerships by Selsky and Parker (2005, p.850), which is *“cross-sector projects formed explicitly to address social issues and causes that actively engage the partners on an ongoing basis.”* The projects that are formed, can be *“transactional”* which means, short-term, constrained, and largely self-interest oriented (Selsky and Parker, 2005), or *“integrative”* (Austin, 2000) and *“developmental”* which means, longer term, open-ended, and largely common-interest oriented (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Wymer & Samu, 2003). According to Siegel (2010, p.36), *“the types of linkages and the interest that formed is between the organization-level alliances, rather than those that occur between individuals or groups of individuals from partnering entities.”* Then, *“the approach is cross-sectoral, as opposed to within-sector, which means that organizations from different sectors, such as government, business, education, and civil society are involved”* (Siegel, 2010, p. 36) and the focus is on social issues or problems, that organizations jointly partnerships to address problems in the society, such as poverty alleviation, health care, education, environmental sustainability, and economic development (Selsky & Parker, 2005).

Furthermore, Gray and Stites (2013, p. 17), in their systematic literature review also define the same thing but used the term of cross-sector partnerships for sustainability, which means that *“are generally defined as initiatives where public-interest entities, private sector companies and/or civil society organizations enter into an alliance to achieve a common practical purpose, pool core competencies, and share risks, responsibilities, resources, costs and benefits”*. These partnerships can help the organizations to achieve the collaborative outcomes that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately (Bryson, et al., 2006; Siegel, 2010). Therefore, in the further term and discussion, the authors use the term of cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs).

2.2 The arena of cross-sector social partnerships

There are four arenas of cross-sector social partnerships according to Selsky and Parker (2005) and Seitanidi and Crane (2009) which are: (1) The partnerships between non-profit organizations and businesses that the intention to address social issues, (2) The partnerships between government and businesses, in the form of public-private partnerships (PPPs), the aim of this partnership is more on public services and infrastructure development, such as water and electricity that have social implications to the society, (3) The partnerships between non-profit organization and governments, which it concentrated more on job development and welfare, and (4) The partnerships that involve organizations from all three sectors or more, and the projects can be established on local, regional, national or international level that aims more focus on economic and community development, social services, health, and environmental concerns. Furthermore, Gray and Stites added one more sector that involved in the cross-sector partnerships, which is the community. The partnerships that formed between community and NPOs called Sustainable Local Enterprise Network (SLEN's), and the partnerships between government and community, named community planning. Hereby the illustration of the form of cross-sector social partnerships.



Picture1. The form of cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs)

Sources: Adopted from Selsky and Parker, (2005); Seitanidi and Crane (2009); Gray and Stites, (2013)

Furthermore, according to Gray and Stites (2013), some partnerships cases, in the beginning, may start from two sectors that become a partner, and then it is spread out to include other organizations from other sectors. Meanwhile, in the arena of CSSPs, that proposed by Selsky and Parker (2005), Seitanidi and Crane (2009), and Gray and Stites (2013), the university is not represented as one of the sectors that part of CSSPs. Furthermore, on the study of Siegel (2010), mentioned that university is also can be involved to join and participate in the cross-sector social partnerships.

2.3 Organizational motives to join and participate the cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs)

The cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs) comprises of three stages according to Selsky and Parker (2005), which are formation, implementation, and outcome. The formation stage is very important and critical for the maintenance and sustainability of partnerships over time (Logsdon, 1991; Siegel, 2010). Organizational motive is one part of formation stage, as according to Gray and Stites (2013, p.31), *“it is important to understand different partner motivations because these differences can produce a mismatch within the partnership and lead to difficulties in working together if motivations are not aligned or complementary.”* Also, according to Austin et al. (2004, p.29), motivations, *“they are the cornerstone on which alliances are built.”* Also, if each of partners has different types of motivations, it may need to form different types of partnerships (Gray & Stites, 2013). Also, understanding the factors that motivate different partners that involve in social partnerships project may help to predict the partnerships, defining the potential opportunity for partnerships and collaborations, that may contribute to solving social issues (Siegel, 2010).

In this section, we present a review from literature about the organizational motives of different organization across sectors to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships. According to Gray and Stites (2013), in the systematic literature review about sustainability through partnerships, there are four themes of organization motives, which are: legitimacy, resources, competency, and society. We would like to adopt these four-themes of organizational motives as the foundation of our empirical finding analysis. But since these motives only covered the explanation for organizational motives of NGO's or business, it needs to elaborate with other studies that investigate organizational motives for government and university. As an example, there is a study by Siegel (2010), that investigate the motives of a university to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships. Also, Gazley and Brudney (2007) and Warner and Sullivan (2004) investigated the motives of government engage in CSSPs project, Hereby the explanation of each theme organizational motives and apply it in relations to the non-profit organization, business, university, or government.

2.3.1 Legitimacy

The organizations enter partnerships because they are expected to do so by social norms and the desire for legitimacy (Siegel, 2010). Legitimacy refers to the social acceptance of an organization based on its conformance to societal norms and expectations (Brown, 2008). According to Gray and Stites (2013), legitimacy is essential for organizations, as it is one of the important factors that affect organizations support to acquire critical resources to sustain for the long-term. According to Siegel (2010), legitimacy is the core of institutional perspective, a symbolic interpretive theory, that originally can be found in the foundational work of Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powel (1983). From the institutional theory perspective, as the public expectations to the firms evolve, to be able to survive and gain critical resources and support, organizations must conform with these expectations and requirements, and thus need to be perceived as legitimate (Argenti, 2004; DiMaggio and Powel, 1983). Some scholars argued that legitimacy as one of the factors that motivate non-profit organizations, business, and university to establish cross-sectoral partnerships. Hereby is the explanation:

2.3.1.1 The non-profit organization motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy

The Non-profit organization can have a legitimacy-oriented motivation for partnering because they want to enhance their organization images and reputation (Gray & Stites, 2013). Partnerships for NPOs as a way to maximize their impacts and to gain broader support from others to achieve their primary mission (Gray & Stites, 2013). According to Heap (1998), NPOs start to build partnerships with the private sector also to improve their credibility. Through partnerships with business, the NPOs could enhance organization capabilities and could become more prominent actors in the society (Gray & Stites, 2013). NPOs also established partnerships as a reactive response to their funders demand to become more accountable in the NPOs resources and outcomes. Therefore, it is necessary to perform legitimacy for the NPOs in order to fulfill the stakeholders' demand (Holzer, 2008; Lee, 2011).

2.3.1.2. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy

Legitimacy is one of the factors that motivate corporations to proactively establish cross-sector partnerships for sustainability because of several reasons, which are: First, they want to gain company images, brands, and reputation for socially and environments responsibility (Gray & Stites, 2013). According to LaFrance and Lehmann (2005, p. 219), *"By becoming part of a partnership that promotes sustainable development, companies have an opportunity to present a 'good global citizen' side to their operations and may be able to booster their public image."* Second, according to Gray and Stites (2013), the involvement of firms in cross-sector partnerships can help them to attract and retain their employees. Thirdly, through partnerships with social and environmental NGOs (non-governmental organizations), the companies could prevent and avoid confrontations from stakeholders (Gray & Stites, 2013). In addition, according to Gray and Stites (2013), the formation of partnerships can come from the reactive legitimacy motivation, which the intention is to save the corporations image after receiving the negative publicity.

2.3.1.3. The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Legitimacy

One of the main motives why universities want to join cross-sector social partnerships because of they want to gain legitimacy (Siegel, 2010). According to Siegel (2010), in their case study, it is found that legitimacy is one of the motivational factors that university establish cross-sector social partnerships. Universities may be required or mandated to create and have partnerships with different sectors either by governments or by accreditation bodies, state agencies, foundations, and professional societies (Kezar, 2006). According to Weeden (1998), private foundations and corporate foundations are provided significant resources for support interdisciplinary and collaborative approaches at universities. In addition, Oliver (1990, p.256) has stated that *"organizations that project the appearance of rationalized activity and cooperation through joint program activity often can mobilize more funding."* So, according to some scholars, organizations attempt to be perceived aligned with the regulations and stakeholders demands, to gain image and reputations, so they are forming partnerships with other organizations (Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Newfield, 2003; Oliver, 1991; Siegel, 2010). Therefore, universities are engaging with make alliances with other organizations in order to express to authorities that they are acting in good faith (Siegel, 2010).

2.3.2 Resource

Resources refer to *“an organization asset, both of financial and social capital”* (Gray & Stites, 2013, p. 32). Theoretical approaches that used by some scholars in relations with the resources-oriented motivations are resource dependency theory and resources-based view theory (Gazley & Brudney, 2007; Gray & Stites, 2013; Siegel, 2010).

Based on the Resource dependency theory, to be able to survive, the organizations required other firms to acquired resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Also, according to Lambell, Ramia, Nyland, & Michelotti (2008, p. 80), *“When a particular resource is critical to an organization’s survival or success, the organization is likely to attempt to either control it or co-operate with organizations that can provide it or regulate its provision.”* Therefore, organizations establish partnerships to be able to improve firm stability, decrease uncertainty, and secure access to essential resources (Emery & Trist, 1965; Gray & Stites, 2013). Besides that, according to Gray and Stites (2013), organizations join partnerships with other organizations, NGOs, or governments because they tend to influence legislation, so it would lower the adverse effect on the organizations. Furthermore, based on the resource-based view (RBV), the competitive advantage can be achieved by organizations, through developing a set of unique assets (Barney, 1991). Thus, the cross-sector social partnerships or the partnerships for sustainability as a means for organizations to access and acquire the unique assets to develop and achieve the competitive advantage (Lin, 2012a; Lin, 2012b). For example, the business when partnering with NPOs, the firm gain knowledge from the expertise from NPOs and also the networks of the NPOs supporters, and it could support firm’s competitive advantage in their markets (Gray & Stites, 2013).

2.3.2.1 The non-profit organization motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources

NPOs starting to build relationship with a private sector due to for enhancing their resources (Fishel, 1993; Heap, 1998; Milne et al., 1996; Seitanidi, Koufopoulos, & Palmer, 2011; Wymer & Samu, 2003), improve access to networks and contacts (Heap, 1998), and facilitate the acquisition of information (Macdonald & Piekkari, 2005). Besides that, according to Gazley and Brudney (2007), the main motivation of NPOs to join social partnerships with local governments is because to secure their financial resources, or in other words to get the funding from governments.

2.3.2.2 The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources

The resource-oriented motivations of businesses creating partnerships with NPOs or NGOs are gaining social capital by partnering with NGOs, which they can get better access of networks to the community, volunteer, and capacity building. Besides that, they also could get economic benefits, such as developing innovative products and markets, and also, they can use their unique resources to solve the social and environmental problems in the society (Gray & Stites, 2013).

2.3.2.3 The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources

The resources-oriented motivation of university to establish CSSPs is because of to secure the scarce of the resources and to stabilize the uncertain environment situation. The condition sources of revenue among public institutions have declined over time, in results the university

has to find other sources of funding from private sources such as private foundations and firms (Siegel, 2010). According to Siegel (2010), in relations to resource dependence theory found as evidence in this study that why university join CSSPs.

2.3.2.4 The government motives to join and participate CSSPs: Resources

The governments interested in social partnerships with the NPOs or NGOs because to get the access of NGOs expertise that mostly lacks in their sector, and it is found in the empirical quantitative study that conducted by Gazley and Brudney in 2007 (Gazley & Brudney, 2007).

2.3.3 Competency

Competencies refer to *“collective learning in organizations, especially how to coordinate diverse production skills and integrate multiple streams of technologies”* (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990, p. 82). According to Gray and Stites (2013), sharing competencies is one of the factors that motivate why different organizations from different sectors such as NGOs or NPOs and businesses create an alliance and join in social partnerships. It because they have very different skills, capabilities, knowledge, and competencies, that could complement each other. Hereby, is the explanation, why business and NPOs join partnerships:

2.3.3.1 The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Competency

There are proactive and reactive competency-oriented motivations for businesses to be involved in CSSPs. The proactive motivations are to acquire expertise from the NGOs or NPOs, to leverage the knowledge from diverse organizations, and to identify the critical emerging issues for the business's stakeholders. Meanwhile, the reactive motivations are to gain external perspectives from the NGOs expertise in regards with the social and environmental problems that businesses face, to get a better understanding and to develop strategies to solve the complex issues (Gray & Stites, 2013).

2.3.3.2 The NPO motives to join and participate CSSPs: Competency

The competency oriented of motivation why NGOs or NPOs join partnerships other organizations is to gain complementary technical and managerial skills for the NGOs itself to expand the organization capabilities beyond the organizations own skills, capabilities, and competencies (Gray & Stites, 2013).

2.3.4 Society

Society oriented motivations of organizations is the intention of the organizations to make changes in regard to address the complex societal and environmental issues for sustainability (Gray & Stites, 2013). Hereby the explanation of society-oriented motivation of businesses, NPOs, and governments when partnering with other sectors to address sustainability issues.

2.3.4.1. The business motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society

There is a proactive and reactive society-oriented motivation when companies join partnerships. Proactive motivation is to influence policy development and to establish legislation in order to minimize the effect on the company. Meanwhile, reactive-oriented motivation is to respond to activist stakeholder demands by addressing complex social and environmental issues through corporate CSR programs (Gray & Stites, 2013).

2.3.4.2. The NPO motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society

One of the motivations why NPOs are interested in partnering with other organizations from different sectors is to spread and improve the public awareness about sustainability and to promote the positive changes in related with sustainability in the businesses and society (Gray & Stites, 2013). In addition, according to Pasquero (1991), in tri-sector partnerships, which is the partnerships involve between NPOs, governments, and businesses, they main motivation is because the increase of partner awareness about the complex social problems that happened in the society, and also the all trisector organizations desire and willingness to contribute to solve the global social problems (Warner & Sullivan, 2004).

2.3.4.3. The university motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society

University motives to join social partnerships with other sectors because they want to contribute to society. In the empirical study by Siegel (2010), found the evident that the motive of university to join the social partnerships moved from the self-interest to social problem solving. One of the consistent citations that gathered from the study was "*the right thing to do*", "*for the greater good*" or "*socially responsible*" (Siegel, 2010, p. 53).

2.3.4.4. The government motives to join and participate CSSPs: Society

The government motives to join partnerships with NGOs or NPOs and with both of NGOs and businesses in tri-sector partnerships is because of they want to solve the societal problems in the society (Warner & Sullivan, 2004). Besides that, the other motives is to deliver the better public service quality and improve city service of access (Gazley & Brudney, 2007).

2.4 The organizational challenge of cross-sector partnerships

In this section, we present the review from the literature about the organizational challenges of different organization across sectors to join and participate in cross-sector partnerships. According to Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000), it is important to develop an understanding about the challenges that face in multi-sector partnerships as it provides insight for the managers and leaders how to prevent and overcome it in the future. Also, according to the literature review by Battisti (2009), about the challenges of cross sector partnerships, there are several different challenges that might occur on different levels of the partnerships, both of organizational and management level.

The challenges that may occur when working with cross-sector partnership are often neglected in the literature about cross-sector collaborations (Child & Faulkner, 1998; Gray, 1989; Hardy & Phillips, 1998; Linden, 2002; Oliver, 1990; Park, 1996). Some of the most prominent issues they may face is repression, exploitation, a questionable management practices, unfairness as well as asymmetrical power relations. According to previous studies in the field, these partnerships often end up with either bad results or no results even after a long time. This process can be very frustrating because, most likely there will be wasted a lot of efforts as well as resources even though the intention behind the collaboration was good (Child & Faulkner, 1998; Gray, 1989; Hardy & Phillips, 1998; Linden, 2002; Oliver, 1990; Park, 1996).

Furthermore, in relation with organizational level of challenges in cross-sector partnerships. First, a study by Babiak and Thibault (2009), that investigated about organizational level of challenges that faced by non-profit organizations and their multi sector partnerships in Canadian sport center, found that there are two areas of challenges: structural and strategic challenges. Hereby is the explanation.

Structural challenges

There are two areas of concerns under structural challenges: (1) challenges with governance, roles, and responsibilities and (2) the complexity partnership forms and structures.

The challenges with governance, roles, and responsibilities means *“the extent to which partnerships are formalized with written rules, policies, and procedures; the degree to which roles in the partnerships are define clearly (i.e. who does what); who was responsible for overseeing major decisions in the relationships”* (Babiak & Thibault, 2009, p. 125). First, according to non-profit respondent in the study by Babiak and Thibault (2009), the cause of the challenges with governance of partnerships is because the lack of efficiency and it resulted the unclear roles and responsibilities in partnerships. Second, another cause of the challenges because the growing number of organizations that involve in the partnerships, so based on private sector perspective there is a constrained of human resources to manage and maintain the operational of partnerships. Lastly, according to the government respondents, the challenge is because they have to consult with their organizational executives, as a result of this it slowed decision making process on several issues included the governance and management of cross-sector partnerships (Babiak & Thibault, 2009).

The challenges with the complexity partnership forms and structure are related to *“issues of the constitution and organization of the partnerships across sectors”* (Babiak & Thibault, 2009, p. 134). This challenge emphasized aspect *“of the complexity of managing different types of partnerships, i.e. funding relationships, philanthropic partnerships, strategic alliances, program-oriented relationships”* that can be found in the group of partnerships (Babiak & Thibault, 2009, p. 134). According to Babiak and Thibault (2009), this complexity forms of partnership cause by several reasons, first, the difference organizations that involved in the partnerships have different ‘business’ language,

expectations, goals, and values. In addition, the geographical difference of partner organizations that involve in cross-sector partnerships, also contribute to make partnerships forms and structure more complex and it needs different structures and systems to facilitate the partnerships between organizations, such as different forms of communication and different avenues for providing programs and services (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). Second, the complexity forms of partnership also cause by the difference expectations between the partners, for example, private business partners perceived that their contribution in the partnerships is enough with their sponsoring the project, meanwhile the other partners expected the private business partners to have more active role in the partnerships project (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). Lastly, the study also found that because of the organizational network dynamic, there is a lack of common ground of partnerships as well as the competition of scarce resources (i.e. funding, athletes, and facilities) (Babiak & Thibault, 2009).

Strategic challenges

There are two areas of concerns under strategic challenges: (1) changing mission and objectives, (2) focus on competition versus collaboration.

The challenges of the changing mission and objectives is related with the changing mission and objectives during the time-frame of partnerships (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). Also, the study by Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000), also found the conflicting goals and mission presented as a challenge in effective multiple cross-sector partnerships. It because, organizations that involved in cross-sector partnerships have different mission, goals, and values (Wondolleck & Yaffe, 2000). Besides that, it also causes by the different sectors operate in different of 'institutional arrangements' of organization, and this 'institutional arrangements' based on 'organizational values' (Oppen, Sack, & Wegener, 2005). The different values between organizations also can lead to problems in partnering between different organizations across sectors, as stated by Carroll and Steane (2000, p.50), *"Partnerships between business, government and non-profits can be problematic when values clash. . . [V]alues or ideology can influence motivations, beliefs, norms of behaviour, and new expectations in managing and delivering a service. In some partnerships, this may take the form of more conscious and overt consideration of the intangibles. For others, priorities regarding efficiencies and transparency may challenge non-profit partners to engage [in] management practices more aligned with the corporate world"*. The same finding also found in a study by Coulson (2005), that different organizational value could become an obstacle in the cross-sector partnerships.

The challenges of focus on competition versus collaboration means that organization that involved in the cross-sector partnerships are competing each other for resources, legitimacy, and power, rather than collaborating each other. This competition, created a tension in partnerships, led to frustration between the partners, and violated the 'true spirit' of collaboration (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). For example, a result from their study found that there were tensions of different organizational interest, between organizations that in regional level and national level, that resulted in the competition between the organizations (Babiak and Thibault, 2009). Some scholars, which are Austin (2000), Huxham and Vangen (2000), and (Kanter, 1994) have been studies about the competitive and collaborative nature of partnerships, but in the context of within-sector alliances (i.e. between two or more non-profit organizations or between two or more private business partners). The pressure of competitive versus collaboration, led to tensions 'within firm - as internal struggles occurred because of reluctance to sacrifice autonomy' and 'between firm - as the desire to gain relative power over others'.

Moreover, another study, found that **organizational norms and culture can be a challenge** for partnerships. It identified by some scholars in their study such as Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000), found that one of the obstacles that occurred in effective cross-sector partnerships is organizational norms and culture. A study by Smith, Carroll and Ashford (1995), the different of organizational culture become one of the barriers that face during the implementation of multi-sector partnerships.

In addition, **Trust** is essential when looking into CSSP or in general when looking at partnership. it because one of the obstacles that may face in the cross-sector partnerships and collaboration is mistrust (Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000). Also, **political influence** also can present as challenges in cross-sector partnerships. such collaborations might be influenced by political decisions and the political debate. Mostly the part in the relationship that will get affected is the governmental part because they are directly regulated by the government (Battisti, 2009). Lastly, the literature review above about organizational challenges in cross-sector partnerships will use by the author as the foundation to analyse the empirical finding in this study.

3 METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

3.1 Methodology

This chapter will clarify our philosophical view and position, inferences, and research design to make it easier for the reader to understand the decisions and conclusions that are made throughout this study.

3.1.1 Ontological and epistemological ground

In terms of our view of reality (ontology) and knowledge creation (epistemology), we accept social constructionism and pragmatism. Social reality (existence, truths, world, reality) consists of inter-subjectively shared, socially constructed meaning and knowledge that produced and reproduced by social actors in the course of their everyday lives (6 & Bellamy, 2012). Similarly denying the objective external world, pragmatists argue the world can only be understood through human experience and have potential to generate useful knowledge through empirical observation (Lisa, 2008). Therefore, these views provide epistemological background of our study which emphasize the linking of theory and practice to position at the intersections of subjectively and objectively held knowledge.

Accordingly, our research ontologically provides the possibility to build theoretical framework for describing cross-sector social partnership. Epistemologically, based on pragmatists' view that knowledge or truths are relative or practical only when providing a tool for reveal of reality, our study intends to contribute the sustainability of the partnerships by directly capturing the nature of problem.

3.1.2 Abductive induction

Starting from empirical observation based on our ontological and epistemological views, our qualitative research questions focuses on the meanings attributed to behaviours and interactions in CSSPs, captured by partners' perspective. Induction is a common way of inference when the study starts with empirical observations as evidence, and builds theories, explanations, and interpretations to reflect or represent those particulars (Lisa, 2008). However, Peirce (1955) argues that induction becomes more productive and certain in combination with abduction which can link theories and practice. This abductive induction referred to by Peirce (1955) admits any inference which involves contextual judgments of relevance and significance has an abductive element. Furthermore, Gary Shank (Lisa, 2008) argued that the power of abduction as a way to reason to meaning can be employed qualitative research, which is the systematic empirical inquiry to meaning. Givón (1989) also presented that initial observation generates a hypothesis which correlate and integrate them into a more general description (other facts or rule), that is, relate them to a wider context in abduction. During the field research, the researchers have used theories back and forth to explore the meanings – as something that expresses or represents something else (Lisa, 2008), linked to a specific themes or domains – in relation to motives and challenges in cross-sector partnerships. Therefore, to answer these questions, we accept the abductive induction or abduction which can be said to be pragmatic mode of reasoning (Givón, 1989).

3.2 Research Methods

To explore the problem inherent in formation and implementation of cross-sector social partnership project, the research uses qualitative research method which is collecting, coding and analysing data (6 & Bellamy, 2012). A case study has been chosen in this empirical research as in qualitative research is not best for using a large number of research samples (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Also, choosing a particular case for a study is useful for understanding a particular phenomenon on theoretical, analytical, or methodological grounds (ed. Lisa, 2008; Hart, 1998). The study collects partners' accounts of their reality from semi-structured interviews that used close and open-ended questions and supplementary documents and re-describing these accounts in social scientific language from priori theories in the literature review, using abductive logic. Considering the nature of interaction of constraining potential of group life (Lisa, 2008), the interviews are created to be more suitable for organization level rather than for individual level.

In terms of research site, Tillväxt Malmö project is chosen in a qualitative case study of cross-sector social partnerships involving local government municipality, private sectors, university, and non-profit organization. Since its building in 2011, the project has been in dominant position contributing to local employment by incubating of entrepreneurs in Malmö city, and its location is relatively easy to use interactive research method such as face-to-face interviews. Our interviewees include individual members of non-profit, public, and academic sectors involved in Tillväxt Malmö project. All participants are now involved in partnerships of Tillväxt Malmö but a participant in academic sector engaged in the early phase of this project from 2011 to 2014.

3.2.1 Data collection

For the conceptual development applied to this study, the data is collected from literature reviews, using relevant scientific articles. The empirical data is transcriptions of interviews collected through a case study where cross-sector social partnerships are relevant for our research. Semi-structured interviews at the individual level explores the perspectives of each organizations which individuals belong to, from different sectors that involved in Tillväxt Malmö project. Audio-recordings are also included during interviews. The secondary data collected was used as a complement to primary data and also to understand the context of the project since in the establishment in 2011 until now.

3.2.1.1 Primary data: Semi-structured Interview

For the primary data, we choose semi-structured interviews as a data collection method (6 & Bellamy, 2012). Silverman (2001, p.87) presents that the interviews in social science strive “...to generate data which gives an authentic insight into people’s experience”. Therefore, we will structure these “unstructured” data from the interviews into meaningful and analyzable units to draw on the answers to our research questions as the study progresses (ed. Lisa, 2008).

Before the interview conducted, the authors build the interview guide. The interview guide started with asking general questions about the information of the role of respondent and the organization in relation with Tillväxt Malmö project, then more narrowed to the questions about the motives to join and participate in the project and the challenges that faced by the respondents during the participating in the project. The example of the interview guide is in Appendix 2.

The perspectives of each partner organization required in this research as it contributes to a better understanding of the organizational motives and challenges that perceived by the representatives of each partner organizations across sectors. The selection of interview respondents

was based upon their involvement in the Tillväxt Malmö project. The chosen respondents were representatives from their organizations that actively involved in Tillväxt Malmö project. Moreover, the sampling of the interview respondents based on the combination of the snowball sampling and purposive sampling. Snowball sampling or chain-referral sampling refers to a non-random sampling method used when characteristics of the samples are difficult to find (Dudovskiy, 2018). First, the authors contacted the person as representatives of the Uppstart Malmö, that have a role and responsibility in the Tillväxt Malmö project. The aim is to get the referral contact information about the persons that in-charge and actively involved in the project, such as the project manager and some partners organizations that involved in the project. In total, five of the semi-structured interview with the project manager of Tillväxt Malmö project, a business developer, a representative from Näringslivkontoret Malmö Stad, and two representatives from private business partners were conducted based on the referral contact information from the representative of the Uppstart Malmö.

In addition, the purposive sampling is applied by the authors, through direct contact with the responsible person from Malmö University. Purposive sampling is a non-random sampling based on the researchers own judgment when choosing members to participate in the study (Black, 2010). The authors selected the respondent of Malmö university based on the judgment that the respondent involved in the beginning stage of Tillväxt Malmö project from 2011-2014 and could give valuable information about the role of Malmö university in the Tillväxt Malmö project and the relations between them. The authors also tried to contact some of the private businesses partners, through the given contact information on their webpage. This included several different contact approaches like phone calls and emails., but the authors cannot conduct the interview with them, because of unavailability of respondents' time and not all of the respondents gave the response. Besides that, the authors also tried to ask the referral contact of the investors through the contact person of Tillväxt Malmö project, but since most of the investors are the top management of the companies, so the authors also cannot get the opportunity to have the interview with the investors.

Therefore, in total 7 interviews were conducted in this study. There are several methods to collect information from interviews, such as face to face interview, by phone, and mail questionnaires (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008). The interviews with respondents' code until A until F were conducted face to face, while with respondent code G were conducted by a mail questionnaire interview. Moreover, the respondents that participated in the interview, joined the project in different periods of time. For example, interview respondents from Uppstart Malmö, the project manager involved in the project since 2011, but the businesses developer started to actively involve in the project in 2017.

Furthermore, the duration of the interview process approximately 50 min - 1 hour. These interviews held in different places, it depends on the agreement with the interviewees. The place varied from the cafe, in the lounge of Hotel, until in the office. The interviews conducted with the presence minimum 2 persons of the authors. The authors divided the role during the interview process, as one of the authors held the interview, the other author was writing notes during these interviews. Furthermore, the interviews conducted in the English language and recorded on the audio-recorder. After the interview, the record transcribed manually by the authors into the text.

Table 2. Information of the interview respondents

Code of respondent	Company or Department	Type or Affiliation	Title or Work	Year participating the project	Date of Interview
A	Uppstart Malmö	Non-profit Organization	Project Manager of Tillväxt Malmö project	2011 - now	April 20, 2018
B	Uppstart Malmö	Non-profit Organization	Business Developer	2017 - now	April 30, 2018
C	Uppstart Malmö	Non-profit Organization	Business Developer	2017 - now	May 4, 2018
D	Malmö Stad - (Näringslivkontoret)	Local government municipality	Project leader of Highway to businesses project	2011 - now	May 4, 2018
E	Malmö University	University	Co-researcher as Tillväxt Malmö project evaluator in 2014	2011 - 2014	May 2, 2018
F	Alumni Company	Private Business - Leadership Service firm	Consultant	2014 - now	May 14, 2018
G	Delphi Law Firm	Private Business - Law firm consultant	Senior associate of Delphi law firm	2014 - now	May 25, 2018

3.2.1.2 Secondary data: Documents

Furthermore, for the secondary data, the authors conducted the document reviews. The documents collected from the interviewees, and the aim is to get the information about the project since the project is started, the partners that involved in the project, and to answers the research questions. For example, as because we cannot conduct the interview with the investors, so to get the information and data about the motivations of the investors to join and participate in the CSSPs project, the authors collected documents that have the information about the motives of the investors. Please find below is the list of collected documents.

Table 3. List of collected documents

No.	Source	Author and year	Document type	Purpose of collection
1	Malmö University	Björk & Sjölander (2014)	Research evaluation report of Tillväxt Malmö project in 2014	To get information of the project and motivations of investors to fund and participate the project.
2	Uppstart Malmö	Tillväxt Malmö (2018)	Company presentation	To develop an understanding of the project and their partners.
3	Malmö University	Emilson (2015)	Phd thesis dissertation : Design in the space between stories	To understand the initial phase development of the Tillväxt Malmö project

3.2.2 Data Analysis

In qualitative research, to understand and interpret documents, content analysis of documents can be carried out by coding to identify similar themes, categories, or codes from a set of data (Kulatunga, Amaratunga, & Haigh, 2007). This process is interpretive because it aims to derive the meanings by categorizing qualitative textual data, allowing the researchers subjectivity, multiple meanings, and is context dependent (Krippendorff, 2004). Primary and secondary data analysis is based on content analysis. Analysis of interviews begins with interpretation and understanding of transcripts from semi-structured interviews, and then transcripts are transformed into theoretically meaningful categories related to research questions. The other texts in the literature or other sources are broken down into categories in order to objectively see the document patterns (Lisa, 2008).

The contents analysis of literature generates theoretical categories, themes or domains related to our research questions. These classifications and categorization (Lisa, 2008) guide to form a coding frame in our study. Thus, the analysis starts with conduct transcription of interviews, identify the concept that emerges from the interview into the code, and the categorization of the concept into categories, such as ‘motives to acquired financial resources’ and ‘motives to gain social capital’. Then, we defined themes based on the related categories that we have been identified in our literature review of organizational motives and challenges. Hereby below on table 4 and 5 are the example of our interview and document analysis.

Table 4. Example of interviews analysis process: starts with defining the code, categorization into category and themes.

Organization	Sample representatives of Quotations	Code	Category	Theme
NPO - Uppstart Malmö	“Do you know it’s a lot about financing projects . And how do you finance a foundation. So, and what then happened is that Uppstart Malmö, you have that Näringslivet, a business life here in Malmö contributing. And of course Malmö stad is also contributing with money to this project. So, actually we can exist, salaries could be payed for us working there. So, you could.. And we can rent an office and we have an infrastructure that we need to work..” (Interviewees C, personal communication, May 4, 2018).	Financing project	Motives to acquired financial resources	Motives : Resources
	“i mean we were trying to make a good network , so key players in Malmö city should be involved. And that was Malmö university or Malmö högskola at that point. And then one idea was that there should come ideas and entrepreneurs from the university that we should help” (Interviewees A, personal communication, April 20, 2018).	Gain network	Motives to gain social capital	Motives : Resources

Table 5. Example of document analysis process: starts with defining the code categorization into category and themes.

Name of Document, (author, year)	Sample representatives of Citations	Code	Category	Theme
Research evaluation report of Tillväxt Malmö project in 2014, (Björk and Sjölander, 2014).	Interview from investor A: “It is incredibly nice to see that in Malmö one can agree on goals and values in this area, and make sure that more people are at work. That's what it's about. I am passionate about Malmö , has always done that, and if we can get more people at work , it will not matter, least important for the next generation, for the children.” (Björk & Sjölander, 2014, p. 9).	Commitment to Malmö Address unemployment	Motives to address societal issues	Motives : Society

3.2.3 Reliability in Research

It is significant to ensure whether or not our research has been accurately depicted to serve its purpose in a given context. The paper explores to find partners' motives and challenges by checking back with participants in order to ensure that the project faithfully is meaningful to the people involved in the partnership. To derive the meaning from textual data, the coding process allows the researchers' interpretation based on our subjectivity, multiple meanings, and is context dependent (Krippendorff, 2004). To help the researchers' interpretations on participants' responses, the researchers conduct pre-interview with a member of Tillväxt Malmö and builds the base for the field research (e.g. important concepts). The interviews are all from different sectors. In order to explore more deeply their point of view and perspectives in the context, semi-structured interview using both closed and open-ended questions are used. Further, the researchers based on the audio-recordings of interviews because audio recordings are a relatively higher level of detail and accuracy rather than simply taking notes. Only one email interviews were conducted because the participant could respond in a setting of their choice due to work. At the data analysis process, the research checks the trustworthy of interview data, using information gained from a relevant report, a dissertation, and other sources.

3.3 Research Ethics

It is essential to address the ethical issues raised by an audio recording in our study, especially not exposing participants' identities (ed. Lisa, 2008). During data collection, the researchers informed participants of the rights to protect the confidentiality and privacy and to stop recording that makes them uncomfortable, because participants are not familiar with the basic premises of human subjects' protections (Lisa, 2008). The purpose of our research and the audio-recordings were mentioned in all contacts with potential participants. The recorded files were kept secured under lock in the laptop of the researcher without identifying information of participants during transcribing the interviews.

4 MAIN FINDING AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the result from the interview that conducted with the representatives of partners organizations that has been involved in the selected case of cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs) project and the result of secondary data analysis. It will be structured and presented in the following of sections: (1) The organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs project, (2) The organizational challenges during implementation of CSSPs project. In this section the authors will presents the themes based on the data analysis process with the pre-understanding of the theoretical background that has been conducted from literature review.

4.1 Organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs Project

In this section, represents the organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships projects. Overall there are four themes of organizational motives that emerges from the empirical finding and data analysis, which are: **society, resources, competency, and legitimacy**. Each of themes consists of several categories that will explain further in the explanation below.

4.1.1 The Non-Profit Organization

There are three themes of organizational motives that emerges from the interview respondents, which are **society, resources, and competency**.

Motives: Society

First, in relation with motives: society, there are several categories that emerges from the interview analysis which are **motives to address societal issues, promote positive change**. All of the interviewee's respondents from Uppstart Malmö confirmed that their main motivation to establish multi-sector social partnerships project is because they want to address unemployment problems in Malmö city and also to create Malmö to be a better city. Besides that, it also because of the raise awareness of the co-founder of the foundation that at that time in Malmö city had faced several problems such as high unemployment rate and high shooting incidents. Hereby is the statement from the interviewee's respondents:

*“So, actually it's start with Dan Olofsson, Dan Magnusson, Percy Nilsson, and the guys who has big companies in town. That, the ... talk of Malmö was always negative you know.. So, it is tough climate, and we have high unemployment in Malmö compare to the rest of Sweden. So we want to **start a positive trends here in Malmö**” (Interviewees C, personal communication, May 4, 2018).*

“So why don't we do something here in Malmö because it was a time when we had a lot of problems with the shootings. Unfortunately, there are still shooting in Malmö but at that time 2011 it was really a lot. That was when the whole idea came up for Tillväxt or actually the foundation and Malmö and then after Tillväxt Malmö was created. There was a gap in the market and as you mentioned a lot of the organizations were focusing on the start ups and not the scale ups and we saw there was a whole here” (Interviewees B, personal communication, April 30, 2018).

Motives: Resources

Furthermore, the second theme organizational motives is **resources** emerges from the result of interview, which are **motives to acquired financial and gain social capital**. The interview respondents stated that one of the motives of NPO establish partnerships is **for financing the project**, both for operational the projects and also to support the local businesses participants to be able to grow their business. That is the explanation of the NPO motives for partnering with the local government or Malmö Stad and the private investors. Because the Malmö Stad could support them through financing the operation of the project, and the private investors, they support through financing the project itself, particularly in the first year of the project and in the current situation, they support the project through investing their money on the local businesses that become participants of the project. Hereby is the statement from one of the interview respondents:

“Do you know it’s a lot about financing projects. And how do you finance a foundation. So, and what then happened is that Uppstart Malmö, you have that Näringslivet, a business life here in Malmö contributing. And of course Malmö stad is also contributing with money to this project. So, actually we can exist, salaries could be payed for us working there. So, you could.. And we can rent an office and we have an infrastructure that we need to work..” (Interviewees C, personal communication, May 4, 2018).

Furthermore, still in relations with the motives to acquired resources, the interview respondents also mentioned about **to gain social capital or networks** among other key players in the Malmö city, such as private companies and university. Therefore, in the early period of the project in 2011, they join partnerships with Malmö university as well. In addition, according to the project leader, Malmö university actively involved only in the first phase of the project between 2011-2014. At that time there were several ideas to have partnerships with the university, which one of the ideas is to support the entrepreneurs from the university to be able participated as participants in the project. Hereby is the interview respondents’ statement:

“i mean we were trying to make a good network, so key players in Malmö city should be involved. And that was Malmö university or Malmö högskola at that point. And then one idea was that there should come ideas and entrepreneurs from the university that we should help” (Interviewees A, personal communication, April 20, 2018).

But, in current situation, all of the interview respondents confirmed that the Malmö university is not involved in the Tillväxt Malmö project anymore. It will further explain in the section challenges part.

Motives: Competency

Furthermore, the last organizational motives theme of NPO is **competencies**. Under this competency theme, category of **complementary competency** emerge, which means to get help from the professionals, such as the private businesses partner. Hereby some of the statements from the business developers of the project:

“Because as a business developer you do not know everything. It would be impossible. Then if you come across a question and you can’t answer it then you know you have twenty partners you could send them to. To help them with a specific question. It’s really a support for us as business developers so we can get help from more professionals” (Interviewees B, personal communication, April 30, 2018).

“Yes. I saw the other day, in fact, one of our partners, it was a law firm, the cost of using a law firm is very very expensive. And this is something that we can offer free of charge. For the companies working with us” (Interviewees B, personal communication, April 30, 2018).

As their private businesses partner enable to provide 40 hours per year maximum, to help the participants of the project in the form of consultancy services.

4.1.2 The Local Government Municipality: Malmö Stad

There are two themes of organizational motives that stated by interview respondents why Malmö Stad interested join and participate of the Tillväxt Malmö project, which are **society and resources**.

Motives: Society

Under this theme, category of motives to **bring benefits to society** emergers, the interview respondent stated that because of the results or outcomes of the project that give benefits for the society of Malmö, that make the Malmö city wants to join and finance the project. Hereby the statement of the representative from *Näringslivkontoret Malmö Stad* :

"because we always to have a reason why we give funding.. and the reason should be of benefits for the citizen of Malmö Stad. They have to have something to offer that we need.. that is should be the benefits for the citizens of Malmö. So, we work for the benefits for the citizens of Malmö. That is the main of our interest. We do not work you know.. in order to make money something like that.. Our purposes to give services to the citizens and so on.. " (Interviewees D, personal communication, May 4, 2018).

Motives: Resources

Under this theme, the interview respondents also mentioned about the category of motives to **gain social capital/ network**, which is to gain more network when it related to the private sectors, so it's easier for them to have a contact with the private sectors. Hereby is the statement from the respondent interview:

"The reason for that is because Tillväxt Malmö, has great network when it comes to private sector. So, it's an easy way to have a contact to the private sector as well.." (Interviewees D, personal communication, May 4, 2018).

In addition, according to interviewees respondent from *Näringslivkontoret Malmö Stad*, it is very important for them to have good relationship and build partnership with the private sectors, as they want the private companies to come to Malmö, open up new business opportunities, and develop good environments that allow the businesses enable to grow in Malmö (Interviewees D, personal communication, May 4, 2018). Therefore, through joining social partnerships in the Tillväxt Malmö project and financing the project, enable them to gain great networks with the private sectors and support the local businesses growth and development.

4.1.3 The Private Sector: The private business partner and private investor

4.1.3.1 Businesses Partners: Alumni and Delphi Company

There are three themes of organizational motives of the private companies to become a business partner in the Tillväxt Malmö project, which are **resources, society, and legitimacy**.

Motives: Resources

First, in relations with theme **resources**, category of motives **to gain social capital/ network** emerges. the interview respondents stated that they want to gain the networks as they want to get connections to the investors that involve in the project. It because they are the potential clients for the company in the future. The interviewees stated that:

“So, it was because we want to know about the different actor in Malmö. What's happening? And.. who's the biggest investor in this project? Oh,, we should have a talk and ask him about his professionals plans, tell him about Alumni, and how we can help him.. So we want to know about this project is... Have a way in... and help those.. and just cooperate... create a positive circle and network in Malmö...” (Interviewees F, personal communication, May 14, 2018).

Motives: Society

Furthermore, another theme that emerges is in relation with **society**. The interview respondent stated that they interested to be a part in the project because they also want **to help local businesses participants in the project**. Particularly, in relations with helping the local business participants, because they think that it is good to do good to people, without necessary people in the outside have to know what they are doing. Interview respondent also stated even though they become a partner of the project, but they do not written it down about that, for example as part of their company CSR program (Interviewees F, personal communication, May 14, 2018).

Motives: Legitimacy

The interview respondent mentioned that one of the reason they interested to join and participate in the project because they think that some events that help by Tillväxt Malmö, as the media for them to be able to promote their company within the key players in Malmö city (Interviewees F, personal communication, May 14, 2018).

4.1.3.2 The Private Investors

Based on interview with two investors that become partners of Uppstart Malmö, that stated in the research report of Tillväxt Malmö project by Björk & Sjölander (2014), the theme of the motives that emerges is **society and resources**.

Motives: Society

The category of the motives that emerges under the society theme is private investors to become partners in the project is **to address societal issues**. In relation with the motives to address societal issues, both of the respondents stated their commitment and intention to contribute to address the societal problems which is unemployment problem in Malmö. Hereby is the statement from the investor A:

"It is incredibly nice to see that in Malmö one can agree on goals and values in this area, and make sure that more people are at work. That's what it's about. I am passionate about Malmö, has always done that, and if we can get more people at work, it will not matter, least important for the next generation, for the children." (Björk & Sjölander, 2014, p. 9).

And also, statement from investor B:

"Malmö's biggest challenge is segregation. We live in two different communities - we live in the west or in Linhamn and those living in Rosengård or in other areas. Possibly you meet on the Ribs on Sundays and pass by each other but it has become a much bigger segregation than when I was young, I experience. It is, of course, that those who get a job learn Swedish and will become part of society. Those who are well-off or dry, they hide as much as they can and do not take the right initiative. I am passionate about other values than I did in the past. Now I see more society at large and what impact we all can have, and maybe you have a task in this life. It may sound ambitious, but it is actually." (Björk & Sjölander, 2014, p. 9).

Motives: Resources

Besides that, based on the report, also stated that the investor A interested because of the motives to **gain social capital/ network**, which is the opportunity to be able to have contacts with other investors or implicitly expresses that the **networking to other investors**. Hereby below is the statement from investor A:

"If you are to be honest - and you should be in such a context - then there was an interest in me to be able to get in touch with the other investors. Even though I do not want to lie around them, I can learn from them and partly to share what's happening around Malmö." (Björk & Sjölander, 2014, p. 9).

4.1.4 University: The Malmö University

The main finding through the interview both to the representative of NPO and Malmö University confirmed that the Malmö University involvement in the project has been changing over time. According to the interview with one of lecture at Malmö University that involved in the project before it was started at around 2010, stated that Malmö University involved before the project established and then become a partner of the project until the first 3 years period of the project from 2011 until 2014. According to the interview respondent, there are two themes of organizational motives that emerge from the interview which are society and legitimacy.

Motives: Society and legitimacy

In relation with the motives to society, the category **address societal issues emerges**. The interview respondents explained that Malmö university interested to join and participate in the project because they want to strengthen the social innovation in Malmö. Behind this motive, the interview respondent also explained that it started because there was an assignment from the city council of Malmö, to develop and find ways to support establishment of incubator for social innovation (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

Moreover, there is an interesting information, that explained about the story before the city of Malmö mandated the assignment for develop the establishment of incubator for social innovation. Based on Emilson (2015), one of the initial drivers, is the critique from Bjarne Stenquist, who was a journalist and writer, that has worked as consultant in the field of Social transformation. He was an outsider to the municipal organization. His critique published in a local newspaper, *Sydsvenkan*, in May 2009, *"wherein he expresses his frustration regarding the inefficiency of the*

municipality's efforts in tackling the Malmö's social challenge" (Emilsson, 2015, p. 66). This critique attracted the attention of the city director Inger Nilsson, that ordered Stenquist to write a report about "how to progress with social sustainability in Malmö" (Emilsson, 2015, p. 67). Then, on Stenquist's report there were three ideas Stenquist also recommended which are area program, social incubator, and innovation forums (Emilsson, 2015). Then, he also recommended "to involve all of resources and actors from the whole city should be mobilized, e.g., citizens, trade and industry, associations, Malmö University and other educational institutions, government authorities, etc., to work in a co-creative process to generate and realize solutions for the sustainable city with a focus on social problems" (Emilsson, 2015, p. 67). Therefore, through this information, we can see how the process Malmö university involved in the process of development idea incubator for social innovation.

Furthermore, based on interview respondent, there was discussion between the city of Malmö and the Uppstart Malmö, so the assignment of the development of the incubator came to the Uppstart Malmö. Then, the Malmö University taken part also in the project, because the assignment that given in the beginning it was still something that related with the incubator for innovation (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018). This is also aligned with the finding from Emilsson (2015, p. 111), that "in the decision document, it states that the incubator should have three interacting principals: the City of Malmö, Uppstart Malmö, and Malmö University". The incubator is refer to the development of Tillväxt Malmö (Emilsson, 2015).

Furthermore, another interesting fact, the interview respondent also mentioned that during the implementation of the Tillväxt Malmö, it became something that different from the project application. According to Emilsson (2015), mentioned as well that during implementation of the project, some of the 'hard goals' of the project is achieved, but the 'soft goals' that related with the incubator of social innovation is not implemented. Moreover, also according to the interview respondent, there were several discussions about the ideas how university took part in the project, which one of the ideas was the students from university could be connected to the companies. But, then the idea did not implement, because it found out not very practical. Meanwhile, the idea that really implemented at that time was the role of university in the project as project evaluator in the first three-year period of the project. After the first three year of the project, Malmö University was not involved in the project anymore. As the interview respondent also stated that below:

"that was because the project itself was developed in a process that involved civil society organizations at the city of Malmö and also Malmö university so we had also kind of collaborative discussion in the beginning on whether this initiative would go. so I became involved because the discussion was about what part Malmö university could have in the project so it was suggested that our role in the project, our uhm contribution would be... to do the evaluation of the project. so that was how I involved. so I became the evaluator of the project from its start." (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

"because we had a discussion in the early phases before I mean the project was about to get started on how the university could take part in the project, couple of ideas because actually the project doesn't look exactly as the project application at first. so if you look at the project application at first, they have suggestions that students ~ university will be connected to companies and so forth but that did not happen" (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

*"... so in the end, and it was quite clear that it wasn't really possible to do much else with Malmö university's role. another part that Malmö university had was to I would say actually **to bring more legitimacy to the project. It's good to university has a partner uhm... make it look better**"* (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

Furthermore, based on the interview statement above, another organizational motives that stated by the respondent is in relation with **legitimacy** that both universities could give or take as a partner of the project.

Hereby in the table 6 is the summary of the organizational motives:

Table 6. The Summary of organizational motives to join and participate CSSPs project based on the interview and document analysis according to the themes that identify on the literature review of ‘organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships’

Sector - Organization	Themes and Categories Organizational Motives			
	Society	Resources	Competency	Legitimacy
NPO: Uppstart Malmö	To address societal issues	To acquired financial resource	Complementary competency (to get help from professionals)	-
	Promote positive change	Gain social capital/ network	-	-
Local government municipality: Näringslivkontoret Malmö Stad	To bring benefits to society	Gain social capital/ network	-	-
Private sector: Alumni company & Delphi company	To help the local business participants	To gain social capital/ network	-	To promote company ‘brand’
Private sector: private investor	To address societal issue	To gain social capital/ network	-	-
University: Malmö university	To strengthen incubator for social innovation	-	-	To gain legitimacy

4.2 Organizational challenges during the Implementation of CSSPs project

In this section the authors represent about several themes of the organizational challenges that emerges from the interviews and document analysis. The themes that presented below, based on the data analysis process with the pre-understanding of the theoretical background that conducted through literature review of “organizational challenges of cross-sector partnerships’. There are four themes that arise from the empirical finding and data analysis, which are (1) the different and changing of organizational mission and objectives, (2) the different of language, logic, and perspective, (3) the difficulty to make organization to collaborate each other and see each other as equal, and (4) the lack of transparency.

4.2.1 The difference and changing of organizational mission and objectives

The first theme of organizational challenges that we found is the strategic challenge. One of the categories of challenges that emerge from data analysis is **the different and changing of organizational objectives and mission**. The interview respondents from Malmö university mentioned about the changing of organization objective in the project, that it lead to the different mission and objectives between the NPO and Malmö University. As mentioned earlier in the part of organizational motives of university to join the project because their objective was to support the development of incubator for social innovation. But the project objective is shifted during the implementation, some of their project goals that stated in the project application is not implemented, such as that related with the social innovation (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018). It is also found on the research report of Tillväxt Malmö project evaluation in 2014 that written by Björk & Sjölander (2014), that mentioned at that time the project changed their goal that it stated in the project application which one of them was to support social innovation and it changed to only focus on support the local businesses entrepreneur to grow and to create more job in Malmö. Therefore, this condition lead to the current situation that Malmö university was not become their partner in the project anymore. Even though in the official website of Tillväxt Malmö, Malmö university is one of the list of their partner, but based on the interviews respondents with the both of respondents from NPO and Malmö university, the Malmö university is not involved in the project anymore since 2014.

Hereby is the answer from the NPO’s interview respondents, when we ask does the Malmö university is still become their partner or not. And the answer is that the university and the NPO have different objectives.

*“It’s not likely.. it’s a partnership. It’s more than that in a bigger content of Malmö, it’s like how do you explain.. in the beginning when Uppstart started, they wanted us to have a more of collaboration, between the two of us or the all of us actually, that a working with helping companies. Then.. a.. **Now, they have decided to go to have a focus more on social entrepreneur..** I was actually see a social innovation summit that was a every year. I was actually at the meeting today.. This morning.. with them... So, we are in the background.. And the... listening in... and offering of course help.. like... and now I was there talking and seeing if we can find a common ground to work on... **It’s... different... because our focus it’s to get people employed.. We don’t have the same really you know...** This... If we are not good in what we are doing... Then we won’t exist... you know... So, our pay back is not money, but how many people could get employed in the companies that we are helping” (Interviewees C, personal communication, May 4, 2018).*

4.2.2 The difference of 'language', logic, and perspective

One of the challenges that emerges from the interview respondents of NPO and Malmö university is the different logics, different languages, and different perspective between the organizational operation that involves in partnerships. Hereby is the statement of co-researcher from Malmö University:

*"... but of course if it's uhm if you have this difference logics where you come from or what your role in a partnerships, it can be difficult to communicate because you talking besides each other, (...) it was a question of that **we speaking different languages with different sort of logics and ideas.** (...) And for them, it was **from a business perspective**, one thing was about business application and doing another thing in the project plan will make perfect chance to them"* (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

It because, even though the Uppstart Malmö, as the owner of the project is a non-profit organization, but the co-founder, project manager, and business developer, mostly have strong business background. Therefore, these differences between institutions strained the partnerships.

4.2.3 The difficulty to make the organizations to collaborate together and to see each other as equal

The interview respondents from Malmö Stad mentioned about the difficulties to make the organizations work together, to collaborate. It because their partner organizations come from different companies, Below is the statement from interview respondent from Malmö Stad:

*"**The hard parts is to make our organizations work together**, collaborate and find new ways of collaborating, making new solutions... because there is a lot of prestige in those organizations, so **that's actually the hardest part.** The collaboration between the different organizations. We **collaborate with different and big companies**, but in reality to make them collaborate, after signing the agreements, **that's the hard part.** To see each other as equals, but it's getting better, and we are working on it"* (Interviewees D, personal communication, May 4, 2018).

4.2.4 Lack of Transparency

The interview respondent from Malmö University mentioned about transparency, that it was not easy for Malmö University to get the informations that they needed for evaluation of the project. Hereby the explanation of the interview respondent:

*"I would say I mean my role was to be evaluator and I was given access to all the material I needed as evaluator. that was because of for Tillväxt Malmö, this was business so they were from business logic. business secrets and so forth. For me, evaluation, knowledge, research, **is about transparency**, knowledge and critical. I mean research asking all the kind of questions I need to ask, so I can't sort of stop somewhere because this is like a business secrets. I would say like give me the information, of course I will keep it anonymous"* (Interviewees E, personal communication, May 2, 2018).

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter aims at presenting the result of main findings and analysis, and then discuss it, in relation to answering the research questions and purpose, which are: 1) What are the organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project (CSSPs), in the case of Tillväxt Malmö project? 2) What are the organizational challenges in cross-sector social partnerships project, in the case of Tillväxt Malmö project? Furthermore, the chapter follows with a shared discussion of the relations between the motives and challenges and how these are interrelated. Furthermore, the final session is the conclusion.

5.1 What are the organizational motives to join and participate in cross sector social partnerships project?

The study presented here has analyzed the organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project. The result revealed the presence of society, resources, competency, and legitimacy as the motives of the organizations to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project.

5.1.1 Society

With respect to 'society' organizational motives, the interview respondents from NPO and private sector (i.e private investors) mentioned that they interested to join and participate the project because they want to address societal issues in Malmö. It is mainly because they are aware of the problems that face by the city of Malmö and they want to contribute to address the problems and to create Malmö to be a better city. In relations with the private investors' motives. The main reason of the private investors wants to become a partner in the project is because they commitment with Malmö and they are highly aware of the issues that faced in Malmö (such as, segregation and high employment compared to general Sweden). Even based on the interview with the respondent from University who is the co-researchers that had been interviewed two of the investors, stated that the investors that put their money on the project realize and understand that they might not get the return of their investments, which means their investment mostly for other people's good. Also, the respondent from the private sector, which are Delphi and Alumni companies, they motive is to help the participant of the project to grow their business by giving free consultancy to them.

In addition, the representatives from the *Näringslivkontoret Malmö Stad* also stated that the main reason that they interested and continually funded the project is that of the outcome of the project that could give benefits for Malmö's society. These motives aligned with the previous study by Pasquero (1991) and also Warner and Sullivan (2004), that in the context of the tri-sector partnerships created (which are NGOs, Businesses, and governments), the main motives is because the increase of each organization's awareness about the complex social problems that happened in the society, and also their desire and willingness to contribute to solving the global social problems.

Meanwhile, the respondent from the Malmö University, the main motives they interested in the project because they want to support the development of an incubator for social innovations. This motive is different with the motives of NPO event though both of them have the same

intention to contribute to addressing societal issues. As the objectives of the Tillväxt Malmö project is changes, from in the beginning one of the goals of the project is to support the incubator for social innovation, while during the implementation of the project, the goals that related with the aspect of social innovation failed to be implemented. And, the NPO have different objectives in the project, to only focus on addressing the unemployment problem in Malmö, by supporting the local business development in Malmö to grow and hire more people. The previous study by Siegel (2010), found that university had an organizational motive to address societal issues through participated in CSSPs. Meanwhile, the finding that the university has the motives to 'society' to address the societal issues, particularly through support the development of incubator for social innovation, it has not been addressed in prior research on cross-sector social partnerships project.

5.1.2 Resources

According to Gray and Stites (2013), the organizational motive of 'resources', it can be both for acquiring the financial and social capital. With respect to 'resources' organizational motives, most of the interviewees' respondents, except university, mentioned 'to gain network' with certain stakeholders that related to the project as the reason why their interest to join in CSSPs project. For example, based on the interview with the project leader of Tillväxt Malmö, one of the NPO motivations to establish CSSPs is to enhance their networks among key stakeholders in Malmö (i.e. university). As according to Heap (1998), the NPO establish partnerships because they want to improve access to networks and contacts. Also, the interview result with a representative of the local government mentioned that the interest in the project in order to have more connections with the private sectors. This finding also same found in both of the interview results with the private businesses partner and investors, as they interested in the project because they want to have more connections with the investors. In accordance to resources-based view (RBV) perspective, the partnerships for sustainability such as CSSPs as one of the way for organizations to access and obtain the unique resources (e.g. the firm enable to gain the NPOs supporter networks and expertise when partnering with NPOs) to develop and improve the competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Lin, 2012a; Lin, 2012b).

Furthermore, only NPOs interview respondents, that mentioned that the reason of they are partnering with the local governments and the private sectors is that they need to finance the project and to support the local businesses participants to gain the financial capital. As according to the resource dependency theory by Pfeffer & Salancik (1978), that the organizations acquired the critical resources from other organizations in order to survive. They likely to get the resources through controlling the resources, establish the alliance with organizations that can provide the critical resources, or manage its provisions (Lambell *et al.*, 2008). This finding also same with the previous study that found NPOs starting to build a partnership with a private sector in order to enhance their resources (Fishel, 1993; Heap, 1998; Milne *et al.*, 1996; Seitanidi, Koufopoulos, & Palmer, (2011); Wymer & Samu, 2003). In addition, a study by Gazley and Brudney (2007), found that when NPOs establish partnerships with government in social partnership project, is due to acquire the financial resources.

5.1.3 Legitimacy

Legitimacy refers to the social acceptance of an organization based on its conformance to societal norms and expectations (Brown, 2008). Legitimacy can be found in the foundational work of Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powel (1983). From the institutional theory perspective, as the public expectations to the firms evolve, in order to be able to survive and gain

critical resources and support, organizations must conform with these expectations and requirements, and thus need to be perceived as legitimate (Argenti, 2004; DiMaggio & Powel, 1983). According to empirical finding, the interview respondents from private business partner and university, mentioned about the term of “brand” and “legitimacy” as one of their motives to participate in the CSSPs project. The private company motives to join in the project is to promote their company brand or image. According to Gray & Stites (2013), legitimacy is one of the factors that motivate corporations to proactively establish cross-sector partnerships for sustainability as they want to gain company images, brands, and reputation. As legitimacy is essential factors that affect organizations to be able to acquire critical resources. For example, in relation to the case of Alumni company, one of their important resources is their future potential clients. As the Alumni company is a leadership consulting company, so they see that the event that held by Tillväxt Malmö project as a forum for promoting the company’s image.

Furthermore, the respondent interview from Malmö university also mentioned that being a partner in the project, it could promote the university among the key stakeholders in Malmö city. Based on an empirical study by Siegel (2010), that investigate why university join CSSPs? and then the result found that the university wants to gain legitimacy. Also, according to respondent interview, before the Tillväxt Malmö project established, the university already involved in the initiative for supporting the development of incubator for social innovation. At that time, the initiative came from the city council of Malmö as the assignment or the mission from the city council. As Malmö university is one part of the social system in Malmö, so they took part in and actively involved in the initiative.

This exemplifies that the university participated in the Tillväxt Malmö project also because in the beginning there was a mandate from the council of Malmö as one of the driven factors for the university to be a part in the project. This is aligned with Kezar (2006), that universities may be required or mandated to create and have partnerships with different sectors either by governments or by accreditation bodies, state agencies, foundations, and professional societies. Also, according to some scholars, organizations attempt to be perceived aligned with the regulations and stakeholders demands, in order to gain image and reputations, so they are forming partnerships with other organizations (Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Newfield, 2003; Oliver, 1991; Siegel, 2010).

5.1.4 Competency

According to the empirical finding, only the NPO respondent that mention about one of their motivations to be a partner with the private businesses partner is “..to get help from the more professionals” (Interviewees B, personal communication, April 30, 2018). As in the project, the role of private businesses partner is to provide 40 hours a year, in the form of free consultancy to the participants of the project. As according to Gray and Stites (2013), sharing competencies is one of the factors that motivate why different organizations from different sectors such as NGOs and businesses create an alliance and being involved in social partnerships. It because they have very different skills, capabilities, knowledge, and competencies, that could complement each other. So, one of the NPO’s motivation to engage with private businesses in the CSSPs project is to get the complementary skills, services, and expertise from the private businesses to help the participants of the project.

5.2 What are the organizational challenges in cross sector social partnerships project?

Besides examining the motives of each organization to join and participate in a cross-sector social partnerships project, it is necessary to look into the challenges that they face as well. In order to be able to solve the challenges, it is recommended to understand what the challenges are? The results also uncovered there are four types of organizational challenges, which are (1) the different and changing of organizational mission and objectives, (2) the different of language, logic, and perspective, (3) the difficulty to make organization to collaborate each other and see each other as equal, and (4) the lack of transparency, that faced by organizations across sector that involved in the cross-sector social partnerships project of Tillväxt Malmö project.

5.2.1 The different and changing of organizational mission and objectives

The different and changing organizational mission and objectives are one of the main challenges that mentioned both in the interview respondents from NPO and Malmö University. As mentioned earlier that Tillväxt Malmö project objectives changed from to support the development of incubator for social innovation in Malmö to support the development and the growth of local businesses in Malmö, so it could contribute to addressing unemployment problem in Malmö. The changing of the objective of the project leads to the different mission and objectives between the NPO and Malmö University. As a result of this, it strained the relationships between NPO and Malmö University. This finding, aligned with the previous study by Babiak and Thibault (2009), in the context of multiple cross-sector partnerships in the Canadian Sports centers, that found that the changing organizational mission and objectives during the span of partnerships, created tensions between some of the collaborating organizations. Also, according to Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000), the conflicting goals and missions exist as barriers to effective multiple cross-sector partnerships. Furthermore, according to Babiak and Thibault (2009), mentioned that one of the causes of the different organizational objectives and missions is because the organizations from different sectors operate in different "institutional arrangements." According to Oppen, Sack, and Wegener (2005), the organizational, institutional arrangements are related to the organizational values. Carroll and Steane (2000), also argued that organizational values can influence the organizational motives, beliefs, norms of behavior of the organizations. As we already knew that, the co-founders of Uppstart Malmö and the employees that in-charged in Tillväxt Malmö project, most of them come from businesses background, so it more closely to the corporate world. Even though the Uppstart Malmö, the organizations are in the form of non-profit organization, but they more expert to help the local business to grow rather than to support the social innovation. Therefore, these different institutional arrangements between Uppstart Malmö and Malmö University, may lead to different organizational motives and lead to the varied and change organizational missions and objectives.

5.2.2 The different of language, logic, and perspective

The different language, logic and perspectives is one of the main challenges that was mentioned among the interview participants. Previous study by Babiak and Thibault (2009), also found that in cross-sector partnerships of Canadian sport centre, between organizations need to set up a different structure and system, such as form a communication strategy to facilitate different organizations could collaborate each other and tackle issues of different 'business language' and expectations among them. The reason for that is because of the different backgrounds and values among them, as the mind-set of the business world operates differently with the mindset

of the governmental or academic institutions. In order to solve these issues an agreement amongst the participants about the communication methods could be made, to avoid misunderstandings between the participants (Babiak & Thibault, 2009).

Furthermore, also one of the main findings is that the university and the local government municipality seen the way the Uppstart Malmo operates and their perspective close to the business world, even though the Uppstart Malmo is a non-profit organization. This situation would lead to different expectations of the role that each participant of the project would have. That is why previous study has shown that even though the ideas behind cross-sector social partnerships may be good, they often tend to not succeed, due to the organizational or operational structure differences amongst the organization participants who are a part of the project (Child & Faulkner, 1998; Gray, 1989; Hardy & Phillips, 1998; Linden, 2002; Oliver, 1990; Park, 1996).

5.2.3 The difficulty to make organization to collaborate each other and see each other as equal

The study found the challenges of the difficulty to work and collaborate each other and see each other as equal between organizations that involved in the case of Tillvaxt Malmo project. The reason behind this is still same with the previous finding before, the interview participants from the local municipality mentioned that because the organizations come from different sectors and size, therefore it's difficult for them to find a common ground of partnerships and see each other as equal. Previous study by Babiak and Thibault (2009), also found the issues that is hard to build agreement and the same understanding between the partners, particularly in the case of Canadian sport center that involved multi-sector partnerships. Therefore, in order for the collaboration to succeed they need to have the same understanding as one another, this means that they should forget that they normally may be competitors or coming from different sectors, and instead they should use the advantages they have from their different backgrounds in order to share some of it to make the project excel as planned. This same issue was also found in previous study by Smith, Carroll and Ashford (1995), that the cultural backgrounds of the different participants could have a negative effect on the project due to misunderstandings.

5.2.4 The Lack of transparency

The transparency in an organization or project is essential in order for all the different parties involved in a project to have trust in each other. When problems with transparency occurs, this can be solved by confronting one another and working on solutions together to solve it. According to Austin (2000), there are partnerships that more focus on the development of relationships that share a common concern about particular societal problems and those partnerships are also interested in building mutual confidence and knowledge. In specific, knowledge is an outcome of interorganizational transparent exchange and can be acquired by being open to mutual interactions (i.e., exploration and discovery) and willing to share experiences (Austin, 2001; Ameli & Kayes, 2011). In particular, according to Lee and Ngo (2012), as universities now play a role in knowledge-based economic development beside the traditional missions such as education and research, they need the relationships with industries and governments. However, because of differences in cognitive styles in collaboration from different language, logic, etc between business and universities (Lee & Ngo, 2012), it is quite difficult to gain mutual benefits. From the interview with Malmö University, the researchers found that the respondent, the role of the evaluator, had a hard time gaining the desired information from other partners. Therefore, there were few mutual benefits between Malmo university and other partners in terms of

the development of relationships. From the interview with Malmö University, the researchers found that the respondent, the role of the evaluator, had a hard time gaining the desired information from other partners. Therefore, there were few interorganizational benefits between Malmö university and other partners in terms of the development of relationships.

5.3 The relations of the organizational motives and the challenges

The motivations are the fundamental base between the alliances that are built between organizations (Austin *et al.*, 2004). In this study, we found evidence that the difference in organizational motives leads to the difficulties of working together during the process of partnerships and resulted in the partnerships relationships cannot be continued anymore. Particularly, in the partnerships case between NPO and university. The interview respondents of Uppstart Malmö and Malmö University confirmed that both of organizations are not partnering anymore in the current situation. The reason is that both of them have different objectives and missions nowadays, as Malmö university intention is to support the development of social innovation in Malmö city, meanwhile, the Uppstart Malmö objective is to support small and medium enterprises in Malmö to be able to develop their business and to hire more people. Gray and Stites (2013), also mentioned that the difference of motives in partnerships would lead to the mismatch between the partners and strain the alliances. In the cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs), it is very important to understand and identify the motivations of different partners to join and participate the CSSPs project as it would affect the sustainability of the partnerships for the long-run.

5.4 Conclusion

In this paragraph, we will describe our research background and purpose and summarize the results of the research with the main findings. Most importantly, contribution to theory and practice will be presented. Lastly, we will show the limitations of our research. Connected with these limitations, we will suggest further research in the future.

5.4.1 Concluding remark

Previous studies on partnerships and collaborations focused on two main areas, which are the organizational motives and key success factors for partnerships and collaboration. Particularly in partnerships, many studies have examined motives and challenges in dyadic partnerships and cross-sector partnerships, whilst there have been very few studies that investigate on the organizational motives and challenges of cross-sector social partnerships projects in the context of more than three-sectors participating in the project, such as non-profit organization, government local municipality, private sectors, and university. Therefore, the aim of this study is to explore organizational motives to join and participate in cross-sector social partnerships project of a non-profit organization with their partners. Also, the organizational challenges that face during the implementation of cross-sector social partnerships project. Particularly in the context of Tillväxt Malmö project to support the growth of local businesses in Malmö city and to address the unemployment problem in Malmö city.

Based on the number of motives and challenges in multi-sector partnerships that we found in the literature, this study has revealed that some of the motives and challenges are also found in the case of cross-sector social partnerships of Tillväxt Malmö project. In regards with organization motives to join and participate in the project, the main findings are, there are four themes of

organization motives that presence in this study which are society, resources, competency, and legitimacy. Organization motive of the society is the motive that presence in all of the representative partners of Tillväxt Malmö project, such as the non-profit organization and private investor motives are to address societal issue and to promote positive change in Malmö city, local municipality and private companies' motive is to bring benefits and to help the local business in Malmö city, and the university motive is to support the development incubator for social innovation in Malmö city. Besides that, another organization motive that found almost in all of the partners except university is to acquired resources such as social and financial capital. In addition, the only non-profit organization that mentioned the motive to join and participates in the project is to enhance their competency which is to get help from the professionals or expert to support their project. Lastly, legitimacy also found as one of the organization's motives to join and participate in the cross-sector social partnerships project. The researcher from the university stated that one of their motives to join and participate in the project is to gain legitimacy within the key stakeholders in Malmö city. Also, the private company mentioned about one of their main motives participating in the project is to promote companies' brand and image.

Partnerships are a strategic way that enables the organizations to access scarce and important resources, such as capital funding, legitimacy, and competency from the expert. Besides that, through partnerships, they also could address societal problems in society and contribute to achieving sustainability. However, at the same time, organizations faced some challenges during the implementation of the cross-sector social partnerships project. As in this project involved more than three sectors, therefore the complexity of partnerships also increased. This study revealed there are four main challenges that emerge. First, the study found that the changing in the objective of the project during the span of partnerships resulted in the different aims between the Uppstart Malmö and Malmö University. This situation resulted in a tenuous relationship between them. Secondly, the difference in language, logic, and perspective present as the main challenges. It because different organizations that involved in the Tillväxt Malmö project come from different sectors. Therefore, they have a different background, language, and institutional arrangements. For instance, the Uppstart Malmö, even though as the non-profit organization but the way that they work, mindset, and language that used closer to the business world. This situation also relates to the third and fourth challenges that found in the study, which is 'the lack of transparency' and 'the difficulty to collaborate together and see each other as equal'. For the researcher from the university and as the evaluator of the project, it is significant to access accurate information based on mutual transparent exchange information between the partners. However, the different 'mindset' and 'perspective' from different partners present as obstacles that resulted in the university hard to gain information during project evaluation. Besides that, the different 'mindset' and 'perspective' also leads to the different partners hard to collaborate together and see each other as equal. Some of the partners of the project that came from different background and size also faced the issue to build the common understanding between the partners to collaborate together.

Furthermore, the study also found that the organizational motive has the important role that determines the sustainability of partnerships between organization. The difference in organizational motives between partners that involved in the project present as the barrier that leads to difficulty to work together during the span of partnerships. As a result of this, the organization partners cannot continue their alliances in the project. Finally, the study also found that the relationship with multiple sectors in this project has different partnership levels. The dominant partners are the government and private sectors that provide critical resources to the project.

5.4.2 Contribution to theory and practice

5.4.2.1 Contribution to theory

The study contributes to provide comprehensive literature about the motives of organization to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships project in the case more than three sectors are participated in the project which are non-profit organization, local government municipality, private sector (private company and investor) and university in the domain to support the growth of local business in Malmö. As the previous literature review from Gray and Stites (2013), only covered the organizational motives of NGO and business to join cross-sector partnerships for sustainability. Besides that, in this study also evidently found that themes of organizational motive that stated by Gray and Stites (2013), which are society, resources, legitimacy, and competency also could be applied in the case of cross-sector social partnerships of Tillväxt Malmö project. For example, the motive of university to join and participate in cross sector social partnerships is for the society, which is to support the development incubator of social innovation in Malmö city. This finding is not yet being found in the previous study before.

Furthermore, the study uncovers the organizational challenge in cross-sector social partnerships project in the context to support the growth of local businesses to address unemployment problem in Malmö city. Meanwhile, some example of previous studies is by Babiak and Thibault (2009) that investigated the challenges that faced by organization in the context of multi-sector partnerships in Canadian sport center. Some challenges that found on the previous study also being found in this study, for example the challenge of different mission and objectives during the span of partnerships and different language, logic, and perspectives. In addition, in this study also found that the different of motives between organization to join and participate cross-sector social partnerships could become barrier of their partnerships.

Finally, the study also exemplifies the possibility of university involved in the cross-sector social partnerships project. Even though, in the case of Tillväxt Malmö, the university participated the project only in the first three years of the project from 2011 until 2014. Therefore, this finding enriched one more sector in the arena of cross-sector social partnerships that previously proposed by Selsky and Parker (2005) and Seitanidi and Crane (2009), which is more than tri-sector partnerships, with university from academic sector as new sector addition.

5.4.2.2 Contribution to practice

The study delivers insight to leaders and managers of cross-sector social partnerships project about the importance to understand the motives of the organization since the beginning or formation stage of partnerships. If between organizations that involve in the project, their motives are not aligned or complement each other, it could lead to the problem, such as the difficulty to work together, and tenuous the relationships between them. Furthermore, the study also presented the organizational challenges that face during the implementation of the multi-sector partnership's project. Therefore, these challenges are important to be understood by the leaders and managers, so they could prepare for the effective solutions that could apply to tackle the issues in the future.

Furthermore, we also propose some recommendations for leaders and managers to prevent the challenges that found in this study. First, it is important for leaders and managers of the project, during the period of partnerships, if there is a change in the objective of the project, it is important to ensure that all of stakeholders from the partners that involve in the project being inform and agree about that, so it may not lead to misunderstanding and the difference of motives

between them. In addition, Babiak and Thibault (2009) suggest that the leaders need to negotiate how these different missions and values will be considered during partnerships and collaborations among organizations across sectors. Besides that, Gray and Stites (2013) also suggest that if each of partners has different types of motives, it may need to form different types of partnerships. Second, as in the cross-sector social partnerships project, more than three sectors are involved, therefore they may have different language, logic, and perspectives, also its hard for them to collaborate together and see each other as equal. According to Babiak and Thibault (2009), the different 'business language' that used across sectors could be tackled by setting up a structure and system such as the forming of communication strategy. Therefore, in order for the project to succeed it is recommended that they agree upon a specific communication form, with specific guidelines on how to communicate. In addition, it is relevant to put an effort into creating a shared organizational culture so that the differences can be as minimized as possible. By doing so, the challenges in regards with seeing the different partners in the partnership as equals will fixed, because the partners work the same way. Moreover, transparency could be improved through an agreement and understanding among the partners since at the beginning of partnerships to be always transparent on sharing particular information that related with the project.

Finally, for the non-profit organizations as the focal organization in the Tillvaxt Malmo project also needs to maintain their dependence on other sectors and to avoid over-dependence on the external financial sources and technical expertise. According to Yaziji and Doh (2009), It could influence their operational capacity as a self-providing organization. It also could impact on the decision making and the coordination level in the entire partnership (García-Canal, Valdéz-Llaneza, & Ariño, 2003). Therefore, non-profit organizations need to balance the expectations of multiple partners that span the spectrum of all sectors (Austin, 2000), in order to continue and develop all partnerships.

5.4.3 Limitation and further research

5.4.3.1 Limitation of the study

We acknowledge that there are some limitations to our study. First, this study only could provide the small number of interviews, because the researchers faced difficulty to get the interviews from the respondents. For example, it is hard to get the access to have the interview with the private investors. Therefore, the information that we provide about the motives from private sectors, particularly the private investors, is only from secondary data or document analysis. Second, when we conducted the study, the interview participants join and participate in the project in the different term of the project. This situation might have an impact on the level of information that the respondent had about the project, for example, the challenges that the respondents experienced it could be affected by how long the respondents have been involved in the project. Third, the study also has the limitation, as during conducted the research, we found that the University in the current situation does not become a partner anymore in the Tillväxt Malmö project.

Moreover, the language differences between the researchers and the interview respondents could have resulted the different interpretation during the interview process. It because most of the interview respondents are Swedish, meanwhile the interview is conducted in English. The last is because the study is a qualitative study; therefore, the personal interpretation from the respondents and the researchers could be affected by the results of the study.

5.4.3.2 Recommendation for further research

First, in regard to the limitation of our study, we could not get an actual interview with the private investors of the Tillväxt Malmö project, as well as a responsible person from the university who is involved in the project today, we only interviewed the person from the first period of the project (from 2011 until 2014). Therefore, we suggest that there is still a need for another qualitative study of a CSSP project, where it is possible to gain a direct interview with the private investors and the university. By doing so, we could investigate deeply about the organizational motives of the private sectors from the perspective of investors in the company to participate the cross-sector social partnerships project and we could examine not only the motive and challenges but also what is their strategy to maintain the success of partnerships. Even though, we understand that it might be difficult to find an example of the CSSP's project that has more than three sectors participated in the CSSPs project. Second, the research on the mix-method between quantitative and qualitative study also needs to examine the organization motives and challenges in more than one case of CSSP's project. The mix-method could complement the result of qualitative study and improve the reliability of the study. Third, longitudinal empirical research would be meaningful to use, when examining the motives and challenges that may change and its connections over time. Alternatively, how the organizational motives and challenges could affect the partnerships in the CSSPs project overtime period.

Fourth, with regards to the case of Tillväxt Malmö project, it needs further research that could evaluate the impact of the project on the society. In the current situation, the actual information about the impact of the project on the society only comes from the side of Uppstart Malmö. Therefore, it would be beneficial for the project itself, if there is a study, which could evaluate the impact of the project to reduce unemployment in Malmö city. Finally, research on the CSSPs project across nations is needed, particularly in a project to address global and transnational issues, and how about such a cultural difference could potentially affect the relationships in cross-national partnerships.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (BEPA), B. o. (2010). *Empowering people, driving change: Social Innovation in the European Union, European Communities.* Retrieved from European Website On Integration: <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/librarydoc/empowering-people-driving-change-social-innovation-in-the-european-union>
- 6, P., & Bellamy, C. (2012). *Principles of Methodology. Research Design in Social Science.* London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Agerskov, S. H. (2015). *Klar! Parat! Arbejdsløs... En antropologisk undersøgelse af dansk arbejdsløshedspolicy og unge, arbejdsløse danskere uden uddannelse.* Lunds Universitet, Sociologisk institution.
- Anderson, E., & Jap, S. D. (2005). The dark side of close relationships. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 46(3), 75-82.
- Arbetsförmedlingen. (2018). *Arbetsförmedlingen: Swedish Public Employment Service, Statistik, Månadsstatistik.* Retrieved from Arbetsförmedlingen : <https://www.arbetsformedlingen.se/Om-oss/Statistik-och-publikationer/Statistik/Manadsstatistik.html>
- Argenti, P. A. (2004). Collaborating with activists: How Starbucks works with NGOs. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 91-116.
- Austin, J. (2000). *The Collaborative Challenge.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, J., Reficco, E., Berger, G., Fischer, R. M., Gutierrez, R., Koljatic, M., & al., e. (2004). *Social partnering in Latin America: Lessons drawn from collaborations of businesses and civil society organizations.* . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Babiak, K., & Thibault, L. (2009). Challenges in multiple cross-sector partnerships. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 38(1), 117-143.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Barringer, B., & Harrison, J. (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through interorganizational relationships. *Journal of Management*, 26, 367-403.
- Battisti, M. (2009). . Below the Surface: The Challenges of Cross-sector Partnerships. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 95-108.

- Björk, F., & Sjölander, J. (2014). *Tillväxt Malmö: Slutrapport Följeforskning*. Malmö: Malmö University.
- Black, K. (2010). *Business Statistics: Contemporary Decision Making 6th edition*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Booth, W., Colomb, G., & Williams, J. (2008). *The craft of research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, L. D. (2008). *Creating credibility: Legitimacy and accountability for transnational civil society*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, 44-56.
- Carroll, P., & Steane, P. (2000). *Public-private partnerships: Sectoral perspectives*. In S. P. Osborne (Ed.), *Public-private partnerships. Theory and practice in international perspective* (pp. 36-56). London: Routledge.
- Child, J., & Faulkner, D. (1998). *Strategies of cooperation*. London: Oxford Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research : techniques and procedures for developing Grounded Theory, 3rd ed*, (Vol. 1). SAGE Publications, Inc., .
- Coulson, A. (2005). A Plague on All Your Partnerships: Theory and Practice in Regeneration. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(2), 151-163.
- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in shared power world*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Donaldson, L. P. (2007). Advocacy by nonprofit human services: Organizational factors as correlates to advocacy behavior. *Journal of Community Practice*, 15, 139-158.
- Downe-Wambolt, B. (1992). Content analysis: method, applications and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13, 313-321.
- Dudovskiy, J. (2018). *The Ultimate Guide to Writing a Dissertation in Business Studies: A Step-by-Step Assistance*. Retrieved 2018, from <https://research-methodology.net>: <https://research-methodology.net/about-us/ebook/>
- EkonomiFakta. (2018). *Arbetslöshet (Arbetsförmedlingen), Malmö*. Retrieved from Ekonomi fakta: <https://www.ekonomifakta.se/Fakta/Regional-statistik/Alla-lan/Skane-lan/Malmo/?var=17255>

- Emery, F., & Trist, E. (1965). The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments. *Human Relations*, 18, 21–32.
- Emilson, A. (2015). *Design in the space between stories: Design for social innovation and sustainability - from responding to societal challenges to preparing for societal collapse*. (Doctoral thesis), Malmö: Malmö University.
- Fishel, D. (1993). *The Arts Sponsorship Handbook*. London: Directory of Social Change.
- Flick, U. K., & Steinke, I. (2000). *A Companion to QUALITATIVE RESEARCH*. London : SAGE Publications .
- García-Canal, E., Valdéz-Llaneza, A., & Ariño, A. (2003). Effectiveness of dyadic and multi-party joint ventures. *Organization Studies*, 24(5), 743-770.
- Gazley, B., & Brudney, J. L. (2007). The purpose (and perils) of government-nonprofit partnership. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(3), 389–415.
- Googins, B., & Rochlin, S. (2000). Creating the partnership society: Understanding the rhetoric and reality of cross-sectoral partnerships. *Journal of Business and Society Review*, 105(1), 127-144.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding a common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: : Jossey-Bass.
- Gray, B., & Stites, J. P. (2013). Sustainability Through Partnerships: Capitalizing on Collaboration. *Network for Business Sustainability*.
- Grudinschi, D., Kaljunen, L., Hokkanen, T., Hallikas, J., Sintonen, S., & Puustinen, A. (2013). Management Challenges in Cross-Sector Collaboration: Elderly Care Case Study. *The Innovation Journal*, 18(2), 1-22.
- Hardy, C., & Phillips, N. (1998). Strategies of engagement: Lessons from the critical examination of collaboration and conflict in an interorganizational domain. *Organization Science*, 9(2), 217-230.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review. Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Heap, S. (1998). 'NGOs and the Private Sector: Potential for Partnerships?'. *INTRAC Occasional Papers Series*(27).
- Holzer, B. (2008). Turning stakeholders into stakeholders: A political coalition perspective on the politics of stakeholder influence. *Business & Society*, 47(1), 50–67.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Ambiguity, complexity and dynamics in the membership of collaboration. . *Human Relations*, 53(6), 771-806.

- Jim, S. (2017). 'Building an effective entrepreneurship eco-system'. Retrieved May 2018, from URBACT : <http://urbact.eu/building-effective-entrepreneurship-eco-system>
- Jupp, B. (2000). *Working Together: Creating a Better Environment for Cross-sector Partnership*. London: Demos, Panton House.
- Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4), 96-108.
- Kezar, A. (2006). Redesigning for collaboration in learning initiatives: An examination of four highly collaborative campuses. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 804-838.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. . Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kulatunga, U., Amaratunga, D., & Haigh, R. (2007). 'Structuring the unstructured data: the use of content analysis'. *7th International Postgraduate Conference in the Built and Human Environment, University of Salford, UK, March 28-29, 2007,,* (pp. 498-509).
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. . Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Lambell, R., Ramia, G., Nyland, C., & Michelotti, M. (2008). NGOs and international business research: Progress, prospects and problems. . *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10 (1), 75-92.
- Le Pennec, M., & Raufflet, E. (2018). Value Creation in Inter-Organizational Collaboration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 817-834.
- Lee, L. (2011). Business-community partnerships: understanding the nature of partnership. *Corporate Governance*, 11 (1), 29-40.
- Leyens, J.-P., Paladino, P. M., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The Emotional Side of Prejudice: The Attribution of Secondary Emotions to Ingroups and Outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(2), 186-197.
- Lin, H. (2012a). Cross-sector alliances for corporate social responsibility partner heterogeneity moderates environmental strategy outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110 (2), 219-229.
- Lin, H. (2012b). Strategic alliances for environmental improvements. *Business & Society*, 51(2), 335-348.
- Linden, R. M. (2002). *Working across boundaries: Making collaboration work in government and non-profit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lisa, M. B. (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1 & 2). USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Logsdon, J. M. (1991). Interests and interdependence in the formation of social problem-solving collaborations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27, 23-37.
- Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E. (2004). Unemployment Alters the Set Point for Life Satisfaction. *Association for Psychological Science*, 15(1), 8-13.
- Macdonald, S., & Piekkari, R. (2005). 'Out of Control: Personal Networks in European Collaboration'. *R&D Management*, 35(4), 441-453.
- Malmobusiness. (2016). *malmobusiness*. Retrieved from www.malmobusiness.com/en/reports/
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Milne, G. R., Iyer, E. S., & Williams, S. G. (1996). Environmental Organization Alliance Relationships Within and Across Nonprofit Business and Government Sectors'. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 15(2), 203-215.
- Mohr, J., & Spekman, R. (1994). Characteristics of partnership success: Partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 135-152.
- Newfield, C. (2003). *Ivy and industry: Business and the making of the American university, 1880-1980*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- OECD. (2013). 2013. Retrieved from Local Job Creation - How Employment and Training Agencies Can Help: <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/lcjus.htm>
- OECD. (2016, November 21). *Job Creation and Local Economic Development*. Retrieved from https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/employment/job-creation-and-local-economic-development-2016_9789264261976-en
- OECD. (2017). *Short-Term Labour Market Statistics: by keyword using "unemployment" and sorting "customise"*. Retrieved May 2018, from OECD: <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=STLABOUR#>
- Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 241-265.
- Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 241-265.
- Oliver, C. (1991). (Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 145-179.

- Oppen, M., Sack, D., & Wegener, A. (2005). German public-private partnerships in personal social services: New directions in a corporatist environment . In G. Hodge, & C. (. Greve, *The challenge of public-private partnerships* (pp. pp. 269-289). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Park, S. H. (1996). Managing an interorganizational network: A framework of the institutional mechanism for network control. *Organization Studies*, 17 (5), 795-824.
- Pasquero, J. (1991). Supraorganizational collaboration: The Canadian environmental experiment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(1), 38-64.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rondinelli, D. A., & London, T. (2003). How Corporations and Environmental Groups Cooperate: Assessing Cross-Sector Alliance and Collaborations. *The Academy of Management Executive* (1993-2005), 17(1), 61-76.
- Seitanidi, M. M. (2010). *The politics of partnerships: A critical examination of nonprofit-business partnerships*. London: Springer.
- Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR through partnerships: Understanding the selection, design and institutionalisation of nonprofit-business partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 413-429.
- Seitanidi, M. M., Koufopoulos, D. N., & Palmer, P. (2010). Partnership formation for change: Indicators for transformative potential in cross sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1), 139-161.
- Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2005, December). Cross_Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 849-873.
- Siegel, D. J. (2010). Why Universities Join Cross-Sector Social Partnerships: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 14(1), 33.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Qualitative Research Issues of Theory, Method and Practice Third Edition*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Smith, K. G., Carroll, S. J., & Ashford, S. J. (1995). Intra and interorganizational cooperation: Toward a research agenda. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 7-23.
- Swank, D. (1998). Funding the Welfare State: Globalization and the Taxation of Business in Advanced Market Economies. *Political Studies Association 1998*, 671-692.
- TillväxtMalmö. (2018, March). Allmän TM Presentation. Malmö.
- UnitedNations. (2018). *Sustainable Development Goal 8*. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg8>

- UppstartMalmö. (2018). Retrieved from Uppstart Malmö: <http://uppstartmalmo.se>
- Warner, M., & Sullivan, R. (2004). *Putting partnerships to work*. . Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Weeden, C. (1998). *Corporate social investing: The breakthrough strategy for giving and getting corporate contributions*. . San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Wondolleck, J. M., & Yaffee, S. L. (2000.). *Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management*. . Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Wymer, W. W., & Samu, S. (2003). Dimensions of business and nonprofit collaborative relationships. *Journal of Non-profit and Public Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 3-22.
- Yazidi, M., & Doh, J. (2009). *NGOs and corporations: Conflict and collaboration* (Vol. 27). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1.

Table 1. The Unemployment rate in Malmö city compare to the whole Sweden from 2008 to 2017.

Year	Malmö (%)	Sweden (%)
2008	7,5	5,0
2009	10,8	7,7
2010	13,0	8,7
2011	13,6	8,3
2012	14,0	8,4
2013	14,9	8,5
2014	14,9	8,0
2015	15,0	7,8
2016	14,9	7,6
2017	14,7	7,5

Sources: (Arbetsformedlingen as cited in Ekonomifakta, 2018).

Appendix 2. Interview Guide

<p>INTERVIEW GUIDE</p> <p>1. BRIEFING</p> <p>Presentation of the interviewees and the aim of the project</p> <p>How will the interview take place</p>	<p>Who are we?</p> <p>Aim of the interview</p> <p>Timeframe for the interviews</p> <p>Inform the respondents that we will record their replies on our telephones</p> <p>The exact company will not be mentioned unless they wish for.</p> <p>Task division</p> <p>Further information</p>	<p>Our group consist of: Ayu, Yoonah and Riem. We study leadership and organization for sustainability at Malmö university and we are currently on our final semester and writing our master thesis.</p> <p>Our aim with the interviews is to explore the factors that drive and motivate, and also the challenges in cross-sectoral partnerships.</p> <p>The interview will last approximately 45 min - 1 hour.</p> <p>We will record all of the replies on our telephones, the record will be used a memorial tool for our ongoing work.</p> <p>The interview will be kept and treated confidentially for one year. Hereafter the interview will be destructed. Moreover, all replies will be kept anonymous, in terms of not mentioning the company name, but mentioning only from what sector, so that no one will be able to drag a parallel to you.</p> <p>My task is to ask the questions, meanwhile my colleague will be in charge of taking notes make sure everything is recorded as well as asking for elaborating questions if relevant.</p> <p>If you have any questions or something is unclear for you now or throughout the interview, please don't hesitate to ask. Furthermore, we just want to remember you that you participate voluntarily in this interview and that you at any given time are allowed to step back or choose not to answer a specific question.</p>
---	---	--

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (Mostly Open Ended Questions) :

1. Will you please present yourself, such as name, your position, and since when you are join in the Tillväxt Malmö project?
2. Can you please inform us in what relation you have been working with Tillväxt Malmö project?
3. What is the main objective of the Tillväxt Malmö project?
4. Could you explain briefly how the idea is started to develop the Tillväxt Malmö project?
5. How does Uppstart Malmö affect or support Tillväxt Malmö project as a project owner?
6. How is Tilvaxt Malmö project is financed?
7. Could you explain about which stakeholders that involved in the Tillväxt Malmö project?
8. What is the role of each stakeholders that involved in the Tillväxt Malmö project?
9. How is the form of partnerships with each stakeholder in the Tillväxt Malmö project?
10. What has motivated you to start the partnership with the Malmö stad, private company, private investors, and University, in the Tillväxt Malmö project?
11. What are the challenges that you face when you developing and has to maintain partnership with the existing partners as well as new ones?
12. How is your strategy to overcome the challenges?
13. How you able to manage partnerships with your partner, (such as Malmö stad, investors, private company, and university)?
14. Are there any report that you shared to your partners to inform about the results or achievement of your project?
15. Have you ever evaluated your project with your partner together? If yes, how the way you conduct the evaluation?

Debriefing		
Wrap up of the interview Practical information	We are just about to finish our interview If you wish to receive a copy of our study, please let us know so that we can arrange that.	Do you have anything you want to add to the interview