



CASE STUDY ENTRY POINTS: DRIVERS AND IMPACTS

Minu Hemmati

This essay is part of a series of papers commissioned by The Partnering Initiative through its Case Study Project to develop insights into the process of researching/writing partnership case studies as tools for change.

Copyright for each paper is shared between The Partnering Initiative, the author and / or their employing organisation.

Different entry points

Case study research into partnerships can use different entry points across the period of a partnership's life cycle: in the beginning, somewhere in the middle, and at the end.

Tennyson (2003a, p4) provided a very pragmatic, operational definition of partnerships: Partnership "is a word used to describe any inter-organisational collaboration where the constituent players (known as 'partners') think of it as such".

Tennyson (2003b) has also developed a schematic overview of the partnering cycle, identifying 12 different phases.




Figure 1: Phases in the Partnering Cycle (Tennyson 2003b, p4)

Research **at the beginning** of a partnership means to engage when or shortly after the 'constituent players' think of their joint undertaking as a partnership. This includes the first few phases described by Tennyson: *scoping*, *identifying*¹, and *building*, and possibly *planning*. Either right from the outset, or sometime along this path, the participants are likely to start thinking of their collaboration as some kind of "partnership" (or using a similar term). Typical characteristics of the beginning chapters of a partnership, as relevant to partnership research, include: an initial idea responding to a perceived challenge or opportunity; a often dynamically developing vision; identifying (additional) partners; building trust and solidifying principles and mechanisms of collaboration. Often, a veritable enthusiastic 'honeymoon' ensues, and people move into the planning phase.

¹ Often, scoping and identifying are not yet part of the partnering process but undertaken by individual initiators of partnerships. However, partnerships benefit from making the first phases a multi-stakeholder effort in themselves. Scoping and identifying by an initial group of 'partners' helps to build ownership and commitment, and adds quality through inputs from a wider range of perspectives.

Based on this model of partnering phases, “**in the middle**” can mean during the phases of *planning, managing, resourcing, implementing, measuring, reviewing, revising, or institutionalising*. Typical characteristics of these phases include: solidifying of goals, action plans, management and implementation mechanisms, resourcing, and reviewing and adapting, as well as institutionalising a partnership and building continuity. Concrete experiences provide learning opportunities and often lead to changes. The likelihood of conflict increases as roles, responsibilities, and resources, are being distributed. People are sensitive towards equity and balance in terms of risks, benefits and power. Revisions are likely to pose challenges as roles in the partnership may change. Leadership is enacted, accepted, and/or challenged and further developed.

Based on the same model, “**in the end**” of a partnering cycle means when the partnership is permanently institutionalized (*sustaining*), or gone through its closure after joint activities have reached their conclusion (*terminating*). Both processes, sustaining and terminating, pose their own challenges, be they welcome or not. One way or the other, a most likely intense period of collaboration in a particular form comes to an end.

Looking at the different phases is as important as looking at the transitions between them as timely and successful transition is key to partnership success. The partners group not only does different things in different phases, it also needs to adapt and transform aspects of their working relationships to move, develop and grow, from one phase to the other.

Generally, when we interact with people to learn about their partnership, they will – within limits and not unbiased - tell us what they have observed, done and learned so far. People reflect upon their experiences - they make sense of them, and that sense will change over time, through reflection and new experiences. Neither the early nor the later learnings are more or less ‘true’ – they are different but both valuable.

It is important to note that the phases of the partnering process are described as “guidelines only. Each partnership will follow its own unique development pathway” (Tennyson 2003b, p4). The author recommends, however, keeping the described phases in mind so as to not neglect important factors of the partnership’s success. I would add that the described phases also don’t necessarily occur in succession, but often in circles or spirals, as planning is reviewed, resourcing re-activated, or institutionalising leads to adding additional partners, and so on.

Drivers for choosing different entry points

Research interest and focus

Case study research is undertaken based on specific interests, which co-determine entry points. Such interests are concerning a) what we want to find out undertaking the case study, and/or b) what we want to communicate using the case study. I am focusing here on the former. Aspects relevant to, or prominent during, different phases of the partnering process can be of particular interest. If direct observation is desired, then the case study research has to be embarked upon during the respective phase(s).

In the *SEED Initiative*², for example, researchers are looking at beginning partnerships. This focus was chosen because this is where we can directly observe the factors of success and failure that are relevant in the *beginning of a partnership*, and to learn more about what conditions are most favourable at the very outset of a partnership effort.

Other researchers are more interested in assessing the “*bottom line*” of partnerships: what contribution do they actually make to sustainable development, and at what cost? Such research interests will be served better when the whole of the partnership, particularly its outcomes, can be observed. This can be done by observing the whole of the partnering process, from beginning to end, or – more effectively – by examining the partnership after it has been concluded.

Another research focus impacting the choice of entry points is an interest in understanding the *partnering process* as a factor of success or failure of partnerships. If we only look at the beginning, and not follow the partnership through its life cycle, we will not see the outcome and be able to link success or failure (however that might be defined) to certain conditions in the beginning. As importantly, we will not be able to observe (concurrent or in hindsight) the partnering process itself, its different stages and transitions. Hence, only qualities of the beginning of the process, or from the middle of the process, will be identifiable as factors of success or failure.

The more we know about process characteristics, such as *dialogue* and *joint learning*, being crucial for partnerships’ success, the stronger is the argument to research partnerships along their life cycle and not choose ‘moments in time’ for measurement. Process analysis, in turn, increases interactions between researchers and partnerships, and thus increases the intervention aspect of research (see below) – another argument to choose the beginning as entry point, and consider an explicit action research approach.

Transitions between different phases or stages of partnership are crucial moments in the partnering process. The transition from planning to managing and implementing, for example, is critical, and often the point where the process gets stuck. This can have a number of reasons, such as ‘diffusion of responsibility’ (when people implicitly assume that the respective other(s) were supposed to take this or the other action), or delays due to initial lack of resources or the need for intra-organizational clearance. Also, increasing experience with the partnership often leads to restructuring and re-assignment of roles and responsibilities. Such transition challenges can cause frustration and negative group dynamics; a successful transition can result in renewed and increased commitment.

Requirements and perspectives of researchers

Researchers themselves have practical requirements for getting engaged. Principally, long term planning of research will allow for actually engaging at the desired entry point, and sort out practical matters such as financial resources, available time, ability to travel if necessary, translations if required, and so on. Many researchers engage in case studies as part of their longer term programmes of work, and many prefer working in teams.

² A partnership programme by IUCN, UNEP and UNDP, aiming to promote, support and understand locally driven, entrepreneurial partnerships for sustainable development. See seedinit.org

Apart from specific research questions being addressed in certain case studies, researchers also bring their own perspectives into the work – experience, skills, background knowledge, theoretical and methodological preferences, and fitting what is required into their long-term interests. In short, researchers are not “neutral personnel” filling a specific role; they do make sense of that role in their own way. In order to ensure that they (can) do the case study work as required, they should be part of the design of the research programme in the first place.

Both these sets of factors will impact the choice of entry points – when and how to engage. For example, the desire to work in a team creates additional research costs; a preference for direct interaction may result in the need to travel (-> time, cost); experience from previous research work will impact the way the researcher perceives a certain case.

The value of being researched

Partnering groups may be interested in being researched in a case study, for various reasons: Interacting with a researcher promotes reflection and meta-communication (see below), which can add value to the process much like supervision or coaching can.

Individual partners may be interested in a case study about the partnership because they feel it adds some ‘objective’ view on what is going on, and possibly rectify imbalances of inequities in the wake of having them uncovered by a ‘neutral outsider’.

Partners may also be interested in increasing publicity and use the opportunities of promoting their partnership when a case study about it is being published – be it to promote the contents and successes of their work, or to promote a particular partnering process model that they use. Such promotion may help to attract additional partners and/or additional resources, both of which can help to widen the impact of the partnership.

These various interests will co-determine the choice of entry point – what story shall be told? How people learned to talk to each other, managed to find, and implement their vision against the odds, and learn a lot about themselves along the way? Or shall the study be about how cost efficient it was to work together and pool resources instead of working separately? The former example requires a look at the whole of the partnership, ideally in direct interaction with a number of partners (during or after the partnership); the latter requires a look at members, structures, contracts, balance sheets, and auditing reports.

Before embarking on case study research, the researcher should try and find out as much as possible about such internal drivers and interests – it is, in some ways, the first step of data gathering about the partnership.

Enablers promoting research

Within the wider sustainability and partnerships community, there are a number of people and organisations interested in having more research on partnerships available, including for political reasons (arguing or criticizing the approach) and for financial reasons (increasing the amount of resources available for partnerships). In general, case studies can be used to attract attention to

partnerships, and they are particularly suitable because they tell lively stories instead of providing statistics.³

There are also organisations, networks and initiatives mainly dedicated to promoting and enabling partnerships, which have made ongoing research part of their programme. The Partnering Initiative is one example. The SEED Initiative is another. As part of its work, The SEED Initiative pursues research and facilitates learning about partnerships. As any other research, SEED Initiative research is guided by a number of hypotheses that reflect the design of the initiative, e.g. focusing on tailor-made start-up support, and combining more technical assistance with nurturing the process through mentoring and coaching. I am using this example to demonstrate a typical context where partnership case studies emerge: they are often linked to a wider effort relating to partnerships, be it critical or supportive.⁴ Hence the way the research is designed, undertaken, monitored, and reported will reflect this context.

Sectoral and organisational aspects

Many companies, intergovernmental organisations, and increasingly non-government organisations have come to realize that they have been working in partnerships for a long time, but have not focused on them and drawn lessons from them in a systematic manner. Hence, they may be embarking on reviewing their own engagement in partnerships, and undertaking case study research about their past and ongoing partnerships. The interest here is a stocktaking, learning, evaluation, and strategic revision.

The particular focus of such a research effort, and the entry points chosen, will depend upon the primary mission and purpose of the respective organisations, their knowledge management, risk management, and assessment needs.

Many corporations are reviewing their stakeholder engagement strategies, often focusing on a cost-benefit-analysis and/or risk assessment and mitigation through partnerships. Intergovernmental organisations face review requirements from Member States, who will look at the “bottom line” but also at inter-agency coordination process, capacity built, and aspects of accountability.

External drivers

In many cases, practical matters outside the control or choice of the researcher drive the choice of entry point. Many case studies are undertaken based on opportunities arising from contacts within the wider sustainability network, and while partnerships might attract research attention - even actively themselves and early on - there is still the need to resource them with a suitable and available researcher and financial resources to undertake the case study. While the research mechanisms are being put in place, the partnership is likely to develop further. Hence, for example, even when entering at the beginning was desired, it is often not possible.

External drivers also include requirements from donors and supporters who wish partnerships to be monitored and evaluated. Supporting organizations may suggest case study research being undertaken as part of, or accompanying a partnership programme that they fund. Such ‘external

³ It is, however, sometimes regrettable how much impact an “n=1 story” may have in a political context.

⁴ A neutral standpoint seems rather improbable – also see the comments on ‘objectivity’ below.

auditing' will often be undertaken at the end of a partnership, with a view to assess the "bottom line". Given the specific characteristics of partnerships – e.g. developing visions and opportunities over time – established monitoring and evaluation techniques are currently being reconsidered by many practitioners and researchers. Partnerships need partly new methodologies for evaluation, and case studies that observe and analyse different evaluation approaches are being undertaken to meet that need.

Donors can have a range of interests in case study research as regards their support for partnerships. Some will be interested in efficient development programmes – for example, efficiently achieving access to sanitation. They may want to compare the number of toilets being made available to people over a period of time, working through a partnership approach vs. others. The entry point will be at the end of the partnership / programme, and it will be focusing on inputs and outputs. Another donor may be interested in long term democracy building and conflict prevention in the same context, and will choose process analysis and assessing long term cross-sector relationship building as the entry points of evaluating a sanitation programme. Both example interests can be served by looking at a partnership for sanitation, yet the resulting case studies will look very different.

Entry points and impacts

Assumptions and preconceptions

Physics Nobel Laureate Heinz von Foerster has expressed the problem with *objectivity* very well: "Objectivity is a subject's delusion that observing can be done without him" (or her). In essence, this means that there is no such thing as objectivity in research. The challenge is particularly evident in the social sciences, but also applies to areas of natural science, such as quantum physics.⁵ Partnership research requires social scientific theory and methodologies. The main methodological challenges in the social sciences are summarized in three major principles: objectivity, reliability, and validity. Objectivity is the most basic, and the failure to deal with it appropriately has negative consequences for the reliability and validity of data and interpretation.

However, nobody, can ever hope to be objective, including towards her/his 'object' of study. To the contrary, s/he will:

- Be driven by certain interests and hypotheses;
- Be constrained as regards the methodologies s/he can use, due to her/his own limitations of skills as well as practical conditions regarding meetings, direct observations, resources, and the like, and the willingness of people to be studied in a suggested manner; and
- Be constrained in terms of time and resources for undertaking the study.

Much work has gone into improving objectivity in the social sciences. One example is the construction of questionnaires and scales of measurement that has become much more sophisticated. The same applies to methods of observation and recording, text analysis and interpretation and so on. It is important to note, however, that such methods can only serve to approximate 'objectivity'. Two conditions remain:

⁵ The so-called Heisenberg Principle implies that the speed of an electron circling an atom core cannot be measured without impacting its location, nor can the electron's location be determined without impacting its speed.

1. In any field of the social sciences, there are a variety of theories with different underlying assumptions about human nature, communication, etc. Researchers will choose some theories over others as the basis of their work, hence asking different questions in different ways.
2. The researcher her/himself will not be able to observe, communicate, interpret, and present her/his findings without her/his own individual characteristics influencing pretty much every step of the way. For example, a researcher may have a tendency to perceive women as more emotionally driven than men, and see men's comments about the partnership as more 'rational' or 'objective' than women's.

Yet we need case studies that offer more than a picture seen through the author's eyes. The only response to that is to make explicit the underlying assumptions, theories, and hypotheses used, as well as personal reactions throughout the research undertaking. The former is a basic scientific requirement, the latter a bit more unusual. Both allow the reader to take into account 'where the study is coming from', and such role taking (the reader slipping into the role of the researcher) will allow readers to construct their own picture of the case study, and the partnership studied.⁶

Readers will construct their own understanding, and make their own sense of the story: They have a better chance of achieving some kind of reliable understanding if the conditions under which the study was produced are explained to them.

Thus, we replace the goal of 'objectivity' (by eliminating subjective influences) with the goal of minimizing uncontrolled, implicit subjectivity.

For the partnership researcher, this means that s/he should explain assumptions, theories, and hypotheses used and explain methodologies chosen. And s/he should be aware of, and able to communicate, her/his own interests, hopes, and concerns regarding partnerships in general, the specific case in question, and the research process itself, including their development over time.⁷ Any research is based on *theoretical assumptions* that spark our interest in particular questions and let us put aside others.

Partnerships research does not happen in a 'bubble', much less do partnerships themselves take place in a bubble. Quite the contrary, partnerships are being pursued because people seek new and more effective ways to address sustainable development challenges. They are being researched because we seek to identify their potential and their limitations, so that we can understand better what their role and place in the wider range of measures towards sustainable development can and should be. They are also being researched to identify factors of success and failure, so that partnering processes can become as effective as possible.

Partnership case studies are often undertaken by people who aim to promote the partnering approach, and aim to help partnerships succeed. Thus, researchers have an interest in their success. Other researchers study partnerships because they aim to demonstrate the limits of the approach.

⁶ See, for example, Devereux 1967, Sommer 1987.

⁷ The "diaries" that partnership brokers at the course in Cambridge are encouraged to use, can serve as a great source of information for this purpose.

Hence, one can argue that no such research will in fact be unbiased – quite the contrary, it will often be interested in demonstrating how partnerships work, or that they work, and under which conditions, identifying factors of success and failure.

The earlier the entry point, the more hypotheses brought into the research can change over time, being corrected or re-directed by empirical evidence. Changing hypotheses over time need to be made explicit in terms of why earlier ones were discarded or modified, and how the new ones influence what questions are asked and how. For example, a researcher may begin by looking at power relations as manifested in who is speaking most during meetings, and who is interrupting whom. S/he may find over time, however, that it is actually the brief conversations in the corridor where decisions are being prepared and set up beforehand – and power relations are more accurately manifested in who is engaged in such conversations and who isn't.

There is also a dynamic component to researchers' interests that is impacted by the entry point: The more time the researcher spends with the partnership while it is ongoing, the more s/he will need to reflect upon their own influence on the process, and make these assumptions and interpretations explicit.

Research as intervention

Entry points also determine the extent to which research constitutes *intervention*: the earlier, and the longer the engagement of the researcher, the more interaction is taking place between researcher and partnership group, and that interaction will impact the partnering process. This is particularly true when using participatory research approaches. I believe that research on partnerships needs to be open and exploratory, and above all, participatory. The actors involved in partnerships groups are *the experts* on their partnerships. As researchers, we should not impose a setting of "research subjects" being "subjected to" (!) observation and testing. Rather, researchers should collaborate with the partnerships, and act in their interest. Research needs to be designed and carried out in a way that makes it worthwhile for the partners groups to spend the time being interviewed, filling out questionnaires, and so on. This includes involving partnership groups in developing the research purposes and specific research questions. Such an approach reflects a spirit of support for partnership, i.e. the ideology of many who work to improve and multiply collaborative approaches. Principally, researchers could examine all kinds of aspects and hypotheses when observing partnerships, but I believe we need to focus on *working with* the partnerships and *learning from them and with them*.

As regards different entry points, positive impacts on the partnering process through research can of course only be achieved when researchers engage before the partnership concludes.

No matter which entry point in the partnering cycle is chosen to undertake research, all direct interaction between researcher and partnership will include *reflection* on what will happen, what is going on, and/or what has happened.

When using group methods for research, i.e. assembling the partnership's actors to conduct group interviews or other methods of observing and consulting the group, research will also prompt *meta-*

communication: The group will communicate about how it communicates and interacts, how people talk to each other and work together.

Both reflection and meta-communication require people to put their thoughts and feelings into words (or other representations such as pictures, organigrams, and the like). This process of 'translation' from thought or feeling into words changes the content of what we think and feel, due to limitations of vocabulary and rules of grammar, culturally specific conventions of what can be said and how, and culturally specific ways of making sense of the world. This simply means that we cannot look into people's mind and record directly what they perceive, think, and feel but are always confronted with a 'translation' and result of constructive sense making. This is true no matter when in the partnering cycle we engage in research.

For example, as participants in the partnering process and being observed and interviewed by a researcher, we will get know what others think about something, or we won't. A conversation with the researcher can prompt a change in behaviour. A group discussion with the researcher can lead to identifying a problem more clearly, and addressing it more effectively.

The effects of such reflection, meta-communication, and sense making on the partnering process itself will vary, depending on methodologies used and on entry points: If we enter into research in the beginning, the individual and/or group processes of reflection will impact the further development of the partnership. If we engage in research at the end of the partnering cycle, no such impacts can happen on the partnership itself as it is already concluded. In other words, beginning research at the beginning of the partnering cycle will only result in case studies of *partnerships with intervention*.⁸ Beginning in the middle is likely to result in a similar effect: while the impact of research interventions on the partnership may be less, there is the additional impact of the change between working without 'being researched' to 'being researched'.

Every conversation, every interaction, including via questionnaire, is an *intervention* – it makes a change.⁹ Every question we ask a partnering group or an individual carries assumptions – be it explicitly or implicitly. If we explain our hypotheses, the partners will have a more correct picture of who we are and what our interests are. If we do not explicitly convey our assumptions, partners will (consciously or not) develop their own assumptions of what we are after: people always interpret what they read or hear, and make their own sense of it. If these interpretative processes remain implicit, we won't know what, for example, they thought we might want to hear, and that may limit the quality of our results.

We can aim at keeping interactions and their intervening nature to a minimum – basically by using solely listening techniques, and leaving the "researched" in charge of where the conversation is

⁸ I am ignoring here the possibility of researching a partnership without the knowledge of the partners. It would exclude intervening interactions but be unethical and therefore should not be considered.

⁹ This is even more pronounced when you don't only do interviews but enter into *dialogue*: a manner of communication that facilitates joint learning, and hence potentially lead to changes in individuals' perspectives and the group's approach and actions. This notion of dialogue is different from 'interview' (as a one way information flow), and from 'debate' or 'discussion' (as arguments being put against each other). (See Buber (1923/1997) for a careful analysis of the concept; also Sampson (1993), Woodhill (2003) applying this same concept in different fields).

going. This will also have significant impacts, as it elicits reflections that would often otherwise not occur, but it keeps the influence of the researcher's own assumptions about partnerships at a minimum.

This methodology is somewhere in the middle between action research and document analysis in hindsight only. These are the extreme points of a *spectrum of researcher-partnership interactions* that can occur. Action research is only possible when researching the partnership while the partnership is ongoing, and pure document analysis of a whole partnering process is only possible after the partnership concluded.

Whenever taking a participatory approach to research, the effort is likely to turn into some kind of *action research*. This is particularly the case when researchers engage early on in the partnering process. Action research is a social scientific approach which was developed early on in educational sciences and then again during the 1960s and '70s aiming to support and improve civil society activities towards participation and self-determination. Action research basically means that the researcher, while observing on the basis of theoretical assumptions (as always) also actively participates in the researched activities aiming to improve them or increase their success. In other words: doing and observing go hand in hand. The fact that research will almost always have an intervening component is being embraced and used rather than aiming to minimize research impacts on what is being observed.

An action research approach carries as many opportunities as it carries risks. The risks in particular relate to objectivity. More attention needs to be paid to minimizing uncontrolled, implicit subjective influences. For example, listening equitably to all actors, and reflecting on one's own biases as a researcher. The more the researcher gets involved in the partnering process itself, the more s/he will be tempted to take sides, and the less s/he will be able to keep a somewhat 'outside' view of what is going on and what her/his own impacts on the process are.

In the case of partnership research, action research will often mean that the researcher also serves as a sounding board, a facilitator, a coach or mentor for the partnership – moving forward with the partnering group. While working with the group in such roles, s/he is obtaining data that would otherwise be inaccessible – direct observations of communication, decision-making, dealing with conflict, and so on, is possible. We can describe the difference between engaging in the process as an action researcher vs. a hindsight, passive observer as the difference between participating in a learning process vs. hearing about people's learnings.

Through embracing some level of active engagement in the partnering process, researchers build a different relationship with the partnering group as a whole and the individuals participating. Engaging more actively in the partnering process, e.g. as a mentor, also changes the network of individual relationships within the group: It adds the component of the different relationships that individual group members will develop with the researcher/mentor. Care needs to be taken regarding equity and impartiality, and avoiding to be used in power games and conflicts.

Risks and benefits of active engagement have to be reflected and weighed vis-à-vis the goals of the partnership case study. They can also be balanced by "back stopping" an engaged action researcher with a researcher, or supervisor, who is there to help reflect and identify biases.

As stated above, I believe the key principle should be to be conscious of and make explicit involvement, identification, biases and developing goals, so that readers can take into account the perspective from which the case study is being presented.

Compounding complexity

The amount and complexity of data that can be gathered and needs to be synthesized in a case study depends on the entry point; the earlier, and the longer the engagement of the researcher, the more data can be gathered, and the more complex the set of data will become.

The earlier the researcher gets engaged, the more s/he will have to deal with different kinds and sets of data to compile, analyse and synthesize. For example, if studying a partnership after its conclusion, direct observations cannot be part of the data set.

The variety of data impacts the complexity of the analytical work: the more different kinds of data we have, the greater the challenge of integration (or, the challenge of presenting different perspectives on the 'subject', depending if integration is desired or not). From a methodological perspective, the greatest challenge remains the 'synthesis' of qualitative and quantitative data. While both result from interactions between researchers and researched, they are fundamentally different in nature. For example, regarding quantitative data, we have statistical methods for checking significance of correlations and differences. Statistical significance, while conventionally defined, offers convenient mechanisms to express that a relation or a difference is indeed 'established', or not. Not-quantified or not-quantifiable data do not offer such convenience – but they tend to provide a bigger, more nuanced picture, because they are obtained through asking broader questions and give more freedom of interpretation, and thus influencing the data gathering process, to those being 'researched'.

However we might judge the different approaches and what preferences we may have: partnership case studies can indeed work with both approaches, and there is no overall framework theory clarifying the relationship between quantitative and qualitative data. Neither should we expect one to develop as the two kinds of data stem from different approaches in the theory of science.

I would not argue to avoid the situation but rather the researcher should a) give sound reasoning to every step and component of data gathering, and b) acknowledge the challenge of combining quantitative and qualitative data and explain how s/e has dealt with it.

Partnering and researching: people and processes

Reflecting on entry points, their drivers and impacts, demonstrates that case study research – and most social scientific research, for that matter – is indeed a process undertaken by people. It is not a "technical" or "mechanical" undertaking as we often associate with the term "research".

Case study research about partnerships is a process in which people communicate and interact with each other directly, in interviews, focus groups and so on, or indirectly, by studying others' documents and actions. In that sense, researching and partnering resemble each other. And they both teach us to pay attention to people and process as they are key fundamentals for success.

Case study research can teach us, and partnerships, many things about how to partner effectively – including, through the mere research undertaking itself, the importance of paying attention to, and investing in people and process.

References

- Asmal, K. 2000. First World Chaos, Third World Calm: A Multi Stakeholder Process to “Part the Waters” in the Debate over Dams. *Le Monde*, 15 November 2000
- Bawden, R. 1997. The Community Challenge: The Learning Response. Invited Plenary Paper, 29th Annual International Meeting of the Community Development Society 27-30th July, Athens, Georgia
- Benner, T., Streck, C. & Witte, J.M.: *Progress or Peril? Networks and Partnerships in Global Environmental Governance*. The Post-Johannesburg Agenda. Berlin/Washington D.C., Global Public Policy Institute, 2003
- Buber, M. 1997. Das dialogische Prinzip. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 8th Ed. Original 1923 (*The Dialogical Principle*)
- Devereux, G. 1967. Angst und Methode in the Verhaltenswissenschaften. Franckfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp (*Angst and Method in the Behavioural Sciences*)
- Enayati, J. 2002. *The Research: Effective Communication and Decision-making in Diverse Groups*. In: Hemmati, M. Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability – Beyond Deadlock and Conflict. pp73-95. London: Earthscan
- Fisher, R.J. 1997. *Interactive Conflict Resolution*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press:
- Hemmati, M. 2002. *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability – Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. London: Earthscan
- Kernberg, O.F. 1998. *Ideology, Conflict and Leadership in Groups and Organizations*. Boston: Yale University Press
- Künkel, P. Das dialogische Prinzip als Führungsmodell, in: Organisationsentwicklung, 1, 2004, pp64–75 (*The Dialogical Principle as a Leadership Model*, in: Organizational Development, Vol 1)
- Sampson, E.E. 1993. *Celebrating the Other: A Dialogic Account of Human Nature*. New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Smith, E.R. & Mackie, D.M. 2000. *Social Psychology* (2nd Ed.). New York: Worth
- Sommer, J. 1987. Dialogische Forschungsmethoden. Weinheim: Beltz / Psychologische Verlagsgesellschaft (*Dialogical Research Methods*)
- Steets, J. 2005. *Developing a Framework: Concepts and Research Priorities for Partnership Accountability*, in: GPPi Research Paper Series No. 1. Berlin
- Tennyson, R. 2003a. Institutionalising Partnerships: Lessons from the front line. *in focus*, Vol 8

Tennyson, R. 2003b. *The Partnering Toolbook*. London/Geneva: The International Business Leaders Forum & and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition

Wollenberg, E., Iwan, R., Limberg, G., Moeliono, M., Rhee, S. & Sudana, M. 2004. *Muddling Towards Cooperation: A CIFOR Case Study of Shared Learning in Malinau District, Indonesia*. *Currents* 33:20-24

Woodhill, J. 2003: *Risk Society & Social Learning*. In: Linking Participatory Practice and Governance Challenges for a Learning Society. Seminar Proceedings & Notes on IAC's emerging work in the area of Facilitating Multi-Stakeholder Processes and Social Learning. Wageningen, The Netherlands: International Agricultural Centre

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



MINU HEMMATI

Minu is a psychologist by training. Minu started her career in academia. Since 1998, she has been an independent advisor working with NGOs; corporations; international agencies; and governments. Areas of work include participation of stakeholders in decision-making; designing and facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogues and partnerships; capacity building and training; gender issues. Minu is a Special Advisor to The Seed Initiative ^ Supporting Entrepreneurs for Environment and Development (IUCN, UNEP, UNDP) and was closely involved in the World Summit on Sustainable Development, 2002. Her book, *Multi-stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability - Beyond Deadlock and Conflict* was published by Earthscan, London, in 2002.

