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Abstract

Current development efforts focus on economic fair play, cultural sensitivity theory, locally driven interventions, and ethical practice. This has led to changes in a number of development areas, including the relationship between development stakeholders. A shift to development partnership was meant to signal the end of development paternalism (e.g., north-south, developed-undeveloped, donor-recipient) and the beginning of development equality. However, for many development stakeholders, the transition has been largely theoretical.

This study addresses the existing gap between development theory and practice. It argues that before the gap can be closed there is a need for greater philosophically-grounded theoretical scrutiny. Therefore, this study combines a philosophical approach with an interpretive theory building methodology to create a theoretical model of development partnership and identity. The study draws on the experiences of the Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education (TTASPE) and its partners.

The model presents a four-phase partnership cycle. Each phase is accompanied by set of key partnership considerations. The purpose of the model is to provide development stakeholders with a philosophically grounded and practically structured framework for assessing and strengthening their partnerships.
Acknowledgements

This work marks the final destination of a journey that began some six year ago. As with any good journey, much of the value is found in the experiences gained along the way. I would like to thank the following people and organizations for adding to the experiences. I would like to thank the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies for accepting and supporting my special case. The various scholarships and fellowships kept food on the table and provided an uninterrupted space for reflection and writing. I would like to thank my various supervisory committee members. In particular, my current committee of Dr. Louis Awanyo, Dr. Judy White, and Dr. Ken Rasmussen. Your balance of questions, criticisms, and supports were crucial in developing the quality and clarity of my ideas. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Stubbs for his merciless, and at times humorous, edits. Thank you to my various office mates for putting up with my externalized thought process. Special thanks are extended to Rotary International, districts 5550 (Rotary Club of Regina), and 7030 (Rotary Club of San Fernando). Being selected as A Rotary Ambassadorial Scholar allowed the research to become truly international. Thank you, as well, to TTASPE and its partners for inviting me into your world. I hope the results of this study are as meaningful for you as they are for me. My final remarks of gratitude are for my supervisor and mentor Dr. David Malloy. Thank you for taking the risk. It was a real pleasure to work with you on your research and to have you play such a pivotal role in my professional development. Had it not been for your class on philosophy and sport, all those years ago, I doubt any of this would have possible.
Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family and friends. As time goes on, it is hard to distinguish between the two…. I was, you see, doing something after all.
Table of Contents

1. **THE ISSUE WITH PARTNERSHIP** ................................................................. 1
   1.1. A Gap Between Theory and Practice .................................................. 1
   1.2. Framing the Issue: TTASPE and Identity ....................................... 3
   1.3. Research Question and Objectives ................................................. 6
   1.4. Methodology .................................................................................. 7
   1.5. Study Outline .............................................................................. 8
   1.6. Conclusion .................................................................................. 10

2. **BACKGROUND: DEVELOPMENT THEORIES, PARTNERSHIP, & IDENTITY** ....... 11
   2.1. Introduction .................................................................................. 11
   2.2. Development and Development Theory .......................................... 13
       2.2.1. Modernization ....................................................................... 16
       2.2.2. Dependency .......................................................................... 20
       2.2.3. Alternative Development ..................................................... 23
       2.2.4. Participatory Development ................................................... 28
       2.2.5. Post-Development ................................................................ 33
       2.2.6. Development as Freedom ..................................................... 36
       2.2.7. Development Partnership ..................................................... 40
   2.3. Framing the Issue ........................................................................... 44
       2.3.1. Social Theory as Practice ..................................................... 46
       2.3.2. Identity ................................................................................ 48
   2.4. Conclusion: Development Theory, Partnership, and Identity ............ 54

3. **RESEARCH PROGRAM: THEORY BUILDING** .............................................. 56
   3.1. The Philosophy of Social Science ...................................................... 57
   3.2. Philosophic Choices ..................................................................... 62
   3.3. Research Methodology and Methods .............................................. 63
       3.3.1. Phase I: Exploration ............................................................... 65
       3.3.2. Phase II: Analysis ................................................................. 73
       3.3.3. Phase III: Classification ....................................................... 83
       3.3.4. Phase IV: Explanation .......................................................... 85
   3.4. Summary ..................................................................................... 87

4. **SPORT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF TTASPE** ......................... 88
   4.1. Sport and Development ................................................................. 89
       4.1.1. The Potential of Sport ............................................................ 89
       4.1.2. A Brief History of Sport and Development ......................... 91
       4.1.3. Impacts and Challenges ....................................................... 94
   4.2. Sport-for-Development and Partnership ........................................ 96
   4.3. Trinidad and Tobago ..................................................................... 98
   4.4. Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education .. 102

5. **DATA ANALYSIS** .................................................................................. 105
   5.1. Partnership Overview ................................................................. 105
       5.1.1. Interviewees’ Demographics ................................................. 105
   5.2. Partnership Links ........................................................................ 107
       5.2.1. Resource Exchange ............................................................. 110
   5.3. Partnership Background .............................................................. 112
       5.3.1. TTASPE .............................................................................. 112
       5.3.2. Commonwealth Games Canada ............................................ 117
       5.3.3. Australian Sport Commission – (ASOP) .............................. 120
       5.3.4. UK Sport ........................................................................... 122
6. CLASSIFICATION & EXPLANATION

6.1. Classification

6.1.1. Vocabulary

6.1.2. Identity

6.1.3. Trust

6.1.4. Responsibility

6.1.5. Rights

6.1.6. Evaluation

6.1.7. Sustainability

6.1.8. Conclusion

6.2. Explanation: A Theoretical Model of Identity and Development Partnership

6.2.1. Phase One: Partner Identification

6.2.2. Phase Two: Partnership Formation

6.2.3. Phase Three: Partnership Action

6.2.4. Phase Four: Partnership Sustainability

6.3. Summary

7. SUMMARY & CONCLUSION: DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP AND IDENTITY

7.1. Summary of the Study

7.2. Contributions of the Study

7.3. Delimitations

7.4. Implications and Future Research

7.5. Conclusion
List of Tables

Table 1: Shifts in Prominent Development Theory .........................................................15
Table 2: Goodwin’s (1997) Schools of Socioeconomic Development ...........................25
Table 3: Oommen’s (2002) Identity Boundaries .............................................................53
Table 4: Hollis’ Philosophic Perspectives On Social Science Research ........................61
Table 5: Resource Group Definitions ..............................................................................111
Table 6: Organizational Focus and Partnership Stance ..................................................140
Table 7: List of Partnership Characteristics and Definitions .........................................143
Table 8: Phase Specific Question ..................................................................................209
List of Figures

Figure 1: Social Science Research Matrix (Hollis, 1994) .................................................. 60
Figure 2: TTASPE's Program Reach in the Caribbean ...................................................... 103
Figure 3: TTASPE Partnership Hub .................................................................................. 108
Figure 4: Partnerships between TTASPE's Partners .......................................................... 109
Figure 5: Phase 1, Identification ...................................................................................... 185
Figure 6: Phase 2, Formation ........................................................................................... 189
Figure 7: Phase 3, Action ................................................................................................. 194
Figure 8: Phase 4, Sustainability ...................................................................................... 197
List of Appendices

Appendix A: Research Ethics Approval ................................................................. 247
Appendix B: Research Question Guide ............................................................... 248
Appendix C: Sport-For-Development Links to the Millennium Development Goals .... 250
Appendix D: Interview List ...................................................................................... 252
Appendix E: Interviewee Demographics ................................................................. 253
Appendix F: Organization Resource Exchange ...................................................... 254
1. THE ISSUE WITH PARTNERSHIP

We cannot solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them. - Albert Einstein

1.1. A Gap Between Theory and Practice

Fowler (2000) states, “in today’s official aid system, only one type of relationship seems to count. It is called ‘partnership’” (p. 1). However, partnership has not always been the first choice in development relationships. Since the late 1960s, early 1970s, partnership lingered along the periphery of dominant development theory and policy. It was not until the mid to late 1990s, that it began to take a more central position (Utting & Zammit, 2009). Barnes and Brown (2011) link the predominance of partnership to four coalescent factors: 1) the end of the Cold War in the 1980s; 2) the disillusion with neoliberal development policy in the early 1990s; 3) a related increase in anxiety about the effectiveness of development aid; and 4) a desire to break from history of paternalistic, neocolonial development efforts.

In the 21st century, partnership offers a broad development narrative that allows a variety of actors with different interests to “read themselves into” a new development era (Barnes & Brown, 2011). Over time, however, old tensions found a new focus, prompting searches for “authentic” partnership. Neoliberal forces questioned whether partnership was really more effective than other development or business relationships (e.g., Idemudia, 2009; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001; MacDonald & Chrisp, 2005) and anti-paternalism voices felt that partnership’s promise of solidarity and mutuality was no match for existing attitudes regarding economic disparity and power (e.g., Abrahamsen, 2004; Pickard, 2007; Reith, 2010). In either case, notes Fowler (1998), “[development
organizations] could be classified as hypocrites if they continue to employ the term ‘partnership’ for what is essentially old wine in re-labeled civic bottles” (p. 137).

In spite of the rapid, and almost ubiquitous, adoption of partnership language by development organizations, there is a limited understanding of why partnership promises a better sort of development relationship, while rarely delivering. Barnes and Brown (2011) suggest that one reason for the gap between partnership theory and practice is a paucity of theoretical scrutiny. More specifically, they argue that the gap between normative partnership theory and applied practice is directly related to the, widely held, complacent attitude of development stakeholders toward partnership theory. Most partnership studies focus on the instrumental and normative dimensions of partnership. These studies try to describe or measure constitutive partnership factors (e.g., a partner delivers what was agreed upon: a partner respects its partner). Although, write Barnes and Brown (2011),

these discussions are undoubtedly fruitful and have tremendous heuristic value, they do not on the whole tend to engage in a more theoretical examination of what a normative appeal to partnership should mean or to tease out the philosophical principles inherent in the idea of partnership.

(p.167)

In short, these studies continually fail to move development stakeholders’ understanding of partnership beyond its potential for hypocrisy because they do not adequately explore the connection between (a) how partnership is conceptualized and (b) what are identified as important partnership attributes and outcomes.
In light of this assertion, the main issue facing development partnership is the gap between development stakeholders’ understanding of partnership theory and the practice it is supposed to inform. Development practitioners and researchers are quick to (im)prove the normative exactness of partnership theory. More often than not, this is done without engaging in a deeper analysis of the philosophic principles inherent in the theory or recognition of the practical implication for adopting such theory. However, it is this type of deeper analysis that can provide practitioners with the kind of clarity into the relationship between what development partnership promises and what it delivers that they seek. As such, the challenge for this study is to explore development partnership in such a way that the essential link between philosophy, theory and practice remains intact.

1.2. Framing the Issue: TTASPE and Identity

This study is situated in the emerging field of sport-for-development. The idea that development issues could be addressed through sporting activity coincides with post-World War II development efforts (e.g., Anthony, 1969). However, it was not until the 2001 that sport was officially recognized by the United Nations as development tool (UN, 2003). Since this time, the number of sport for development initiatives has ballooned. Unfortunately, research into this area has not kept pace (van Eekeren, 2006). Sport-for-development, argues Coatler (2010), lacks theoretical and policy coherence. As such, there is need for critical reflection on and assessment of sport-for-development programs (Coatler, 2010b), processes (Schulenkorf, 2010a), and relationships (Burnett, 2011, Kay, 2012). More to the point, as Black (2010) suggests, in a space where development priorities and policies are often unstable and inconstant, there is a long-term need to
understand and to build relationships. To this end, this study focuses on a particularly successful sport-for-development organization operating from Trinidad and Tobago.

In 2002, the Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education (TTASPE) was no more than two guys, an aging Toyota Sunny, and a bag of volleyballs. The idea for TTASPE took root in the passion, frustration, and optimism of its co-founders, Mark Mungal and Andre Collins. Mark and Andre met during their time in teachers’ college. Both men were passionate about sport’s transformative potential, frustrated by the way that physical education was delivered in Trinidad and Tobago, and optimistic that they could make a difference. Ten years later, TTASPE is internationally recognized as a leading sport-for-development organization in the Caribbean.

While much of TTASPE’s success can be attributed to Mark’s and Andre’s tenacity, they are the first to admit TTASPE would not be what it is today if it were not for a lot of other people and organizations. Over the years, TTASPE has done a good job of attracting a bright, energetic, and ambitious staff. It has also done a good job of establishing strong relationships with a variety of local, national, regional, and international organizations.

In 2010, TTASPE decided it was time to take a step back and evaluate these relationships. In the past ten years, TTASPE entered into a number of different partnership agreements. Some were simpler than others. Some were more enjoyable than others. Some were more rewarding, and some more fulfilling. However, as the organization proved successful, and the staff gained more confidence, Mark and Andre began to question TTASPE’s partnerships. It was clear to them that TTASPE’s future success hinged on its ability to maintain and foster good partnerships. Therefore,
TTASPE needed to understand what made it a good partner and what partners were good for it.

One way to address TTASPE’s desire to know more about its partnerships is through a discussion of identity. Identity, writes Baaz (2004), is an important, but under scrutinized facet of development: “Debates on development have been characterized by silence about identity and how identities…shape development aid practices” (p. 1). Such neglect is understandable, she argues, given the historic emphasis on the economic dimension with development and neo-Marxist perspectives that approach identity through power dynamics. Identity, however, involves more than just power. The meanings and workings of identity, states Baaz, “have their own dynamics that cannot be read merely as a reflection of unequal economic relations” (p. 2). Furthermore, as organizations broaden their exposure to a wider range of stakeholders, exploring identity becomes critical to gaining a better understanding of complex relationships, such as partnership (Brown, 2001; Tomlinson, 2008).

In keeping with the current issue, identity (e.g., the aid worker, the expert, the local, government, the corporation, the undeveloped, the organization) requires more than set of descriptive traits. It requires a deeper exploration of interaction between how we describe ourselves and what we do, and the implications of these: identity, as a philosophic construct, allows for this.

Our identity, argues Taylor (1989), is manifest in the interaction between our ontological self (what I am) and our ethical self (what should I do).1 Taken together,

---

1 Ontology is the philosophic study of human being. The central question to ontology is what is it to be human?, or what does it mean to be human? Ethics (synonymous with morality) is the philosophic study of human behaviour. The central question to ethics is:
these dimensions of selfhood allow us to frame the most fundamental of human questions: *who am I?* The answer to this question demands consideration of both who I am at this moment (a contemporary-historical analysis) and who I may be (future projection). This particular trajectory is underpinned by a system of values and valuation.

Articulated or not, our identity, expressed as an identity framework or *moral ontology*, serves “to provide the basis for discriminations about appropriate objects or valid responses” (Taylor, 1989, p. 9). It is the thing that allows us to a) distinguish good from bad, or right from wrong, and b) make a distinction between the *self* and the *other*. Important to this study, identity, when articulated, allows us to better understand our actions and interactions. It is also the factor that allows us to close the gap between theory and practice and to articulate what makes us a good partner and what makes a partner good for us.

### 1.3. Research Question and Objectives

Development practitioners are pragmatic. Their primary concern is demonstrating success in what they do. Most often, this translates into a focus on things like program effectiveness, monetary accountability, or bureaucratic efficiency. The need to prove good work does not leave a lot of time for philosophic inquiry. As I was often reminded over the course of this study, philosophy is intrinsically rewarding, but it does not pay the bills. However, Barnes and Brown (2011) argue that trivializing philosophic inquiry in this way presents a major stumbling block for advancing our understanding and practice of development partnership. In short, the authors suggest that philosophic inquiry should

---

what should we do? In recent work, notes Marquez (2005), both philosophic and non-philosophic, ethics has been emphasized at the expense of ontology. However, to do so, argues Taylor (and others, e.g., Nietzsche, Heidegger) artificially limits, if not impairs, our self-understanding.
not been viewed as a luxury in development practice. Rather, it should be accepted as an essential part of truly pragmatic development approach. As such, the primary research question is, *who are development partners?*

Asking “who are”, rather than “what are” development partners compels us to look more closely at the identity framework, or moral ontology, on which partnership is founded. In striving for a deeper understanding of partnership, we must first establish a clearer picture of partnership in practice. For this reason the study also focuses on (a) the normative elements and instrumental functions of partnership and (b) the way in which these elements and functions are manifest in practice.

Building on the research question and study focus, two objectives are identified. The primary objective of this study is to create a theoretical model of sport for development partnership that allows practitioners to explore the philosophical underpinnings and implications of partnership. More specifically, the objective is to create a model of partnership that encourages practitioners to explore their identity, as a philosophic construct. The second objective is to provide TTASPE and its partners with insight into their partnership experience.

1.4. **Methodology**

De Groot (1969) argues that all research efforts share three features: foundational facts, theoretical frameworks, and interpretation (pp. 37-45). Different research programs approach these features in a slightly different manner, but none can escape them. Theory building is one such program. Unlike other research programs, theory building does not necessarily rely on the collection of new data, but on defining a closed set of findings. Its aim is “to find or establish relationships [between findings] by means of tentative
applications of, or derivations from, some theory or hypothesis – or conception or view” (p. 309). In short, theory building demands a synthesis of both ideas and experience. As will be seen in the next section, de Groot (1969) identifies four phases of theory building: exploration, analysis, classification, and explanation. These phases constitute the formal shape of this study and guide the research towards a theoretical model of identity and development partnership.

1.5. Study Outline

Chapter Two outlines the theoretical background and connections that will guide the practical research component. It opens with a brief discussion of relationship between development theory and practice. It is argued that while development practice is often driven by theory, the dominant theories continue to change. These changes are, in part, to development experiences (both failures and success) and a desire to address the perceived shortcomings of current theories. Beginning with its post-World War II inception, development theory is traced from ideas of progress and modernization, through dependence, expansion of basic needs, post-development, and participatory development, arriving eventually at partnership.

At this point, the chapter’s focus shifts from the specific problems of development partnership to the more general issue of social theory. Guided by the work of Charles Taylor (1983, 1989), the chapter claims that social theory is understood as a political act of identity formation. As such, changes in development theories are to be understood as more than just changes in ideas; there must be a fundamental shift in who we are. Approaching development theory in this way opens up the possibility for a deeper philosophic exploration of development partnership. It is here that the theoretical
framework for the study is established. The discrepancy between development partnership theory and practice, it is argued, can be framed as a matter of incomplete identity formation. More specifically it is a failure to acknowledge partnership as an extension of our moral ontology.

Chapter Three details de Groot’s (1969) methodology for theory building, outlining the specific methods and markers used in the research program. Given the theoretical nature of the study, the research allows for a blended ontology investigation, based on an epistemology of understanding (see Hollis, 1994). Drawing in participatory and decolonizing methods, the investigation probes both individual and organization influences and interactions.

Chapter Four provides an overview of the case in question. It offers a brief history of sport-for development and outlines the current trends in programming and research. Special attention is given to works directly related to sport-for-development partnerships. From there, the chapter provides some context for TTASPE as the central focus of the study.

Chapter Five offers analysis of the study data. Analysis is divided into three sections. Partnership Overview provides a sketch of the breadth of TTASPE’s partnerships and demographic information on the interviewees, and shows the existing links between TTASPE and its partners. Partnership Background offers a summary of each partner’s focus, general partnership position, and specific partnership with TTASPE. Partnership Factors gives an overview of the characteristics and environmental influences that shape development partnerships.
Chapter Six combines the final two phases of de Groot’s (1969) methodology. Classification makes the connection between the theoretical foundation of development partnership and identity and the data analysis in order to create meaningful constructs and categories. Once established, these constructs become the building blocks for the theoretical model of development partnership. Chapter Seven gives a summary of the study, discusses possible implications and applications of the model, and further areas of research.

1.6. Conclusion

Partnership is a popular yet misunderstood “next step” in development theory and practice. As practitioners seek to bridge the gap between their expectations and experience, it seems that a strong theoretical foundation is a good place to start. This study argues that understanding partnership requires a closer examination of our identity. The model presented in this study does not solve the problems of development partnership. However, it does encourage development partners to explore beyond similarities in language, structural differences, or potential operational efficiencies. Most importantly, it shifts attention from the narrow focus of what partners should do to the more encompassing gaze of who should partners be?
2. BACKGROUND: DEVELOPMENT THEORIES, PARTNERSHIP, & IDENTITY

The idea that unintended consequences of human action are responsible for many of the big changes in the world is not hard to appreciate. Things often do not go as we plan. (Sen, 1999, p. 245)

2.1. Introduction

Partnering, writes Brinkerhoff (2002), “is promoted both as a solution to reaching efficiency and effectiveness objectives, and as the most appropriate relationship defined by its value laden principles” (p. 21). However, in practice it is often difficult for development practitioners to distinguish partnership from business as usual (Eade, 2007; Lister, 2000; Vincent & Byrne, 2006). Barnes and Brown (2011) suggest that the gap between development partnership theory and practice is not a matter of poor theory. It is a matter of poor theoretical scrutiny. The majority of development partnership studies focus on defining instrumental and normative characteristics of partnership (Brinkerhoff, 2002). Such studies have a strong pragmatic analytic function, but remain overly superficial. Simply listing partnership traits does not adequately address the philosophical principles on which these traits are founded, and obscures the practical implications of engaging in such a principled relationship.

This lack of theoretical attention is not unique to development partnership. As Taylor (1983) outlines, there is a general tendency in Western thinking to be overcomplacent in our approach to theory, and social theory in particular. He argues that our complacent attitude towards social theory allows us to make generalizations about who
These generalizations blur our true identity, and in doing so, mask our ability to understand and engage in complex relationships, such as partnership.

This study aims to close the gap between development partnership theory and practice. It does so in two ways. First, it examines development partnership theory within the broader context of post-World War II development theory. Second, it establishes identity as a framework for increasing our attention to, and understanding of the link between theory and action.

In the early 1950s, development efforts were predominantly shaped by modernization theories. These theories suggested that all societies developed along the same, economic, trajectory. However, as countries failed to progress as expected, other development theories began to dominate practice. Over the next sixty years, development theory and practice have gone through a number of epochs. Partnership mark an attempt to address the historic theoretical and practical inadequacies that emerged during these epochs and inspire a new era in development cooperation.

Development theories are social theories. They serve to clarify our core values and describe our preferred mode of action. Taylor (1983) argues that social theories also serve to challenge, criticize, and transform who we are. They are an attempt at self-definition, or identity formation. Baaz (2004) argues that “the issue of identity is important to understanding how development aid is planned and negotiated” (p. 2). Identity, in this context, is not something that already exists. It is something that takes shape through the intentions, actions, and interpretations of partners. Most important to this study, identity offers a window into our philosophic principles (Taylor, 1989).
2.2. Development and Development Theory

Development is a universal social construct.² Regardless of the time or culture, social groups have an inherent propensity to improve their quality of life (Cowan & Shenton, 1996; Rojas, 2001). Dower (1988) argues that this universal affinity for development is founded on our moral commitment to determine what should be changed and what should be preserved.³ If this is the case, then development theories, as social theories, seek to explain a particular notion of a good life, and establish a course of action (e.g., policy, programs, and projects) for achieving this life. They are a statement about who we are and who we hope to be.

Since its Post-World War II inception, international development efforts have undergone several paradigm shifts. These shifts occur when there is a general consensus that the paradigm is flawed. The paradigm is deemed flawed when it: a) provides an inaccurate concept of people or cultures; b) draws an inaccurate characterization of practice; or c) fails to produce the intended result. These potential flaws are not mutually exclusive. They often combine to dislodge one theory and promote another. For example, early versions of modernization assumed that all peoples and cultures were essentially the same, and that they all progressed along the same industrial path: both assumptions proved wrong. What all of these flaws have in common is a demonstrated gap between theory and practice.

² Arguing that development is a universal social construct does not deny the fact that development continues to vary from one social context to another.
³ Sen (1999) expresses similar thought in examining positive and negative freedom: whereas freedom is the aim of development, positive freedoms allow people to do something (e.g., pursue meaningful work) and negative freedoms protect people (e.g., freedom from religious persecution.)
This section explores the trajectory of major development theories, beginning in the early 1950s with modernization theory and ending in 2000 with development partnership (see Table 1). The progression listed here marks the dominance of a particular theory and not its particular origin. Most if not all of these theories have co-existed over the past sixty plus years of development. However, tracing the shifts in prominent theories shows a general drift in development thinking towards relationships between development participants based on equality, cooperation, and trust (Pieterse, 1999). Following this particular trajectory of theories also provides insight into why the philosophy of development partnership remains hidden within the current partnership theory.
Table 1: Shifts in Prominent Development Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Historic Prominence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>1950&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>1960&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Development</td>
<td>1970&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Development</td>
<td>1980&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Development</td>
<td>1990&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development as Freedom</td>
<td>2000&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partnership</td>
<td>2000&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1. **Modernization**

During the final phase of World War II, the idea of development became institutionalized as the child of structural economic theory and Western political alliance. In 1944, Allied leaders met at the Bretton Woods Hotel to discuss a structural plan for the new world economy. The focus of this meeting was to understand the events that contributed to the global depression of the 1930s and to establish mechanisms (i.e., restructuring international finance, developing a multilateral trading system, and constructing a system for economic cooperation) for preventing such events from happening again.

The conference resulted in the formation of three major institutions, designed to create a stable and liberal international trading environment. The institutions were: 1) the International Monetary Fund (IMF), 2) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)\(^4\), and 3) the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The IMF provided short-term loans to governments facing balance-of-payment difficulties. The World Bank was created to invest money in the reconstruction of war-torn Europe and to assist in the development of less developed countries. The GATT aimed to lower the barriers to trade among member states. While the impacts of these institutions are important in and of themselves, our main concern is the theory on which they were founded.

At the time of the Bretton Woods conference, Western economic and social thought was dominated by modernization theories. Modernization theories are a

---

\(^4\) Stiglitz (2003), suggests that the term “Development” was added as an afterthought to the original mandate of the Word Bank. At the time, he notes, “most of the countries in the developing world were still colonies (p.11).
heterogeneous group of theories that share the tenets of the sister terms, modernity and progress. Modernity is linked to a post-enlightenment belief in the pre-eminence of empirical knowledge, an enthusiasm for technological progress, and a desire for systematic reform (Power, 2008). Progress, notes Marcuse (1964), “is not a neutral term; it moves toward specific ends, and these ends are defined by the possibilities of ameliorating the human condition” (p. 16). Combined, modernity and progress provide a range of modernization theories that view development as a set of standardized transitions from current to improved states of being.

Rostow (1960) provides the classic example of modernization theory. His non-communist manifesto identifies five stages of economic growth necessary for development from a traditional society to one of high mass consumption. These stages, states Rostow, “are not merely a way of generalizing certain factual observations about the sequence of development of modern societies. They have an inner logic and continuity” (p. 53). Rostow was correct on this last point. All theories have an internal logic and continuity. However, his first assertion proves to be more suspect. One of the major criticisms of modernization is its Eurocentric/Western interpretation of progress. As Larrian (1989) notes, only if the social superiority of Western industrialization is taken as fact can the history of Western society (economic or otherwise) provide a template for development.

---

5 Huntington (1971) summarizes the common themes of modernization as: revolution, complexity, phased systematization, globalization, homogenization, irreversibility, and progression.

6 Mohan and Hickey (2004) discuss the current iteration of modernization theory, namely critical modernization, in which each group(s) is able to establish its own interpretation of progress.
In practice, modernization theories were at the heart of the U.S. championed Marshall Plan for rebuilding war-torn Western Europe (Degnbol-Martinussen & Engberg-Pedersen, 2003). The Marshall Plan provided billions of dollars to war-torn Europe. These dollars were targeted towards re-industrialization, with the expectation that a healthy economy would translate into a substantial increase in the standard of living. Reinhert (2009) argues that the Marshall Plan “is probably the most successful economic development assistance project in human history” (p. 98). Banking on the success of the Marshall Plan in Europe, Western nations offered similar assistance in other parts of the world (i.e., Africa, South America, the Caribbean, and parts of Asia). Labeled as development assistance or development aid, these efforts focused on establishing specific patterns of economic growth and stability in areas of transport infrastructure, capital input, and technology in order to increase national profits (Moyo, 2009). It was then assumed that this new national wealth would be used to improve the standard of living for people around the world (Sagar & Najam, 1999).

However, this was not always the case. Rodney (1973) notes, that in Africa, “Marshall Plan” spending was targeted towards a small group of European based companies. In effect, the spending provided foreign interests (mainly American) with control over African resources. In Rodney’s assessment, this was nothing more than a continuation of colonialism. More recently, Lockwood (2005) links “Marshall Plan” assistance to clientelism. Clientelism proves to be a destabilizing force for economic and political development. Here, development assistance is provided to national government, which in several instances (e.g., Cote d’Ivoire, Kenya, Tanzania) has contributed to neo-paternalism; bureaucratic power is centralized, corruption is more prevalent, tribal
connections are emphasized, and incidences of public violence increase. The point to be made is that modernization established a natural social trajectory. By doing so, it also created a structure that placed development expertise and decision-making powers in the hands of North American and Western European elites (i.e., white males with worldviews firmly entrenched in the ideals of enlightenment). It also, inadvertently or not, provided a disproportionate benefit to those (Foreign or Domestic) who had progressed further along the trajectory.

Along with this worldview came a particular set of cultural descriptors. Development rhetoric, borrowing from Rostow (1960), divided the world into economic (i.e., modern-traditional) and social (i.e., developed-undeveloped) dichotomies. The sharp divide between the capitalist democratic West\(^7\) and the communist Soviet Bloc added to the discussion. The differences between their political and economic ideology was used to create political and intellectual labels that further separated the world into three segments: first world (advanced capitalism), second world (advanced communism), and third world (a mixed bag of non-advanced others) (Rapley, 2007).\(^8\) Whatever the intent of these terms, progressive differentiation, or “laddering” (see Sachs, 2005), created classes of people who were, by definition, unequal to others.

By the late 1950s and early 1960s, there was a growing discontent with the prospects of modernization theories. In theory, modernization was supposed to transform traditional economies to Western levels of development through scientifically proven knowledge and technology. In practice, it was linked to greater levels of poverty and

---

\(^7\) Western Europe and North America.

\(^8\) Rapley (2007) characterizes the third world as having low per capita incomes, low industrialization and manufactured exports, and a colonial past linked to imperial powers.
inequality (Qizilbash, 1996). The major criticisms of modernization theories are that they are excessively homogenizing, too narrowly focused on economic growth, and unflinchingly ethnocentric (e.g., Zimmerman, 1979). Though modernization was hopefully optimistic (Pieterse, 2001), the systematic institutionalization of development was driven as much by nationalistic self-interests as it was by altruism. Critics such as Moyo (2009) describe these initial development efforts as toxic investments that used poverty reduction as a thinly veiled strategy for establishing the technological privileges of modern progress and securing strategic geopolitical holds. Other critics (e.g., van Nieuwenhuijze, 1979) describe these same initiatives as generally positive efforts that were corrupted by negative forces and short-sighted thinking.  

2.2.2. Dependency

Dependency theory emerged from Latin America in the mid-to late 1960s. To a great extent, it was a historical critique of development theory and practice. Like modernization, dependency theory is more accurately understood as a collection of theories connected by three main points. First, dependency theories seek to account for the sustained underdevelopment of Third World nations (e.g., works of Prebisch) or the essential link between capitalist expansion and subordination (e.g., works of Baran). Second, argues Pieterse (2001), they “[criticize] development thinking for being ahistorical, for concealing historical relationship…and for denying the role of imperialist

---

9 Rostow (1960), for example, was unable to imagine economic development beyond the stage of high mass-consumption.
10 Around the same time, dependency and Marxist though also had a major impact on academic, intellectual, and political activity in the Caribbean (New World Group). This Caribbean nuance was associated with a period of rapid decolonization in the region. However, notes Marshall (2008), this movement did not carry the same momentum as in Latin America, due in part to the cultural isolation and political fragmentation of the Caribbean nations.
exploitation in European modernization” (p. 24). Third, dependency theories share an affinity for Marxist-Leninist thought. As such, their analysis tends to focus on issues of class, power, and (in)equality, as demonstrated through the relationship between the “centre” (First World) and the “periphery” (Third World).

Under the general category of dependency, Roberts and Hite (2007) identify two key schools of thought. School One argues that dependency and underdevelopment are not a phase but a condition of capitalism (e.g., Frank, 1967; Kay, 1975; Sweezy, 1972). For this school, dependency can be overcome only by a complete rejection of the capitalist system. Frank (1967) supports this view in his discussion of the plight of dependent citizens: “[t]hey will not be able to accomplish these goals [becoming independent] by importing the sterile stereotypes…which do not correspond to their…reality and do not respond to their liberating political needs” (p. 84). School Two recognizes the impact of dependency but allows for relative improvements by which those people at the periphery are able to cluster closer to the center (e.g., Boyer & Drache, 1996; Cardoso, 1972; Cardoso & Faletto, 1979). The structuralist theories put forward by the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) are part of this school of thought. For example, Cardoso (1972) argues “that in specific situations it is possible to expect development and dependency” (p. 93). To assume otherwise would be to disregard, or oversimplify, the diversity within a country.

Immanual Wallerstein (1979) presents a third approach to dependency theory. His world system theory differs from other schools of thought in that it draws on a much broader field of experience. Instead of looking at a particular geographic area or time period, Wallerstein draws on world history. Tracking cycles of integration, order, turbulence, transition, and reconstitution, he argues that while the idea of centre and periphery nations remains constant, their specific geography continues to shift.
As dependency theorists began to garner support, so too did their critics, both within and outside the theoretical family. From within, Frank’s work was criticized for its erroneous interpretation of Marx’s capitalism and its overgeneralization of dependent societies (Larrian, 1989). Also, the overlap of scholarship and politics created tension between policy-oriented research and contemplative study. Policy-oriented scholars argued that contemplation without action was meaningless. Contemplative scholars argued that policy-oriented research was too often a self-justification of political ideology. As discussed by Marshall (2008), the demise of the New World Group in the Caribbean was the result of such a tension. Outside of the field, dependency theories were challenged on three main fronts (Packenham, 1992): 1) they were overly reliant on utopian ideals, such that real-world development experiences were only measured against ideal-world concepts; 2) they were unverifiable, meaning that empirical data could only serve to support dependency perspectives, and not address its fundamental claims; and 3) their focus on critical thought did not provide much in the way of constructive alternatives.

The greatest strength of dependency theories was their ability to promote critical thought. Rather than seeking out ways to improve modernization, they encouraged deeper reflection on its founding principles (i.e., linear development, Westernization, and economic growth). However, in disrupting the monolithic grasp of modernization, dependency theories did truly provide an alternative development strategy. The focus, suggests Pieterse (2001), was on alternative interpretations of modernizing principles and not alternative principles. Nevertheless, while dependency theories may not have directly provided alternative development principles, their emphasis on critical and leftist thought
proved a fertile ground for the future wave of alternative and, later post-development, theories. As Degnbol-Martinussen and Engberg-Pedersen (2003) argue, dependency theories offered critical support for inclusion of the periphery in identifying development factors, goals, instruments, and methods.

2.2.3. Alternative Development

As development thinking moved into its third decade, there was a general discontent with development practices based solely on a Western notion of economic growth. Raul Prebisch, considered by many to be a father of dependency theory, provides a powerful example of this shift in thinking:

My great concern, after having spent so many years close to the facts, is the following. The time has arrived for authentic forms of interpretation of what is going on in the Third World countries. Not to build new development theories, independent of the theories of the centres, but to contribute to global theory of development that embraces both the centres and the periphery, and to do this on the basis of new facts that could not be seen in the 19th century. Global in this sense, and also global in the sense that there is no scientific possibility of explaining development or the distribution of income solely on the basis of economic theory. (1979, p. 7)

Prebisch marks a growing acceptance of a holistic approach to development. Though still important, economics was repositioned as one part of a multi-dimensional approach to development. Development, writes Haque (2004), came to be understood as being “shaped and reinforced by economic needs and demands, social class and political power structures, cultural norms and beliefs, and ideological and intellectual orientation” (p. 1).
Thus, development efforts diversified in two key ways. First, development efforts began to focus on broader issues of poverty reduction, basic needs, and environmental sustainability (Friedmann, 1992). Second, increased attention to the power imbalance between the periphery and the center provided a space for alternative development and evaluative methods and epistemologies.

An expanded development approach allowed for more dynamic responses to development issues. For example, poverty reduction could be addressed through economic, education, and health policies or strategies on national security, land management, and governance. It also permitted a broader set of development indicators and indices. Development evaluation, argues Morse (2004), must now address notions of process (How do we get there?) and achievement (Did we get there?).

The early part of this theoretical shift was dominated by positivist approaches to development. Goodwin (1997) identifies two main schools of thought: 1) individual happiness (e.g., Basic Needs Approach, Physical Quality of Life Index, or Human Development Index), and 2) economic justice (e.g., Pareto, Friedman, Mills, and Rawls) (see Table 2). Both schools agreed that careful study would yield a set of universal variables and standards that could be established and measured.
Table 2: Goodwin’s (1997) Schools of Socioeconomic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Goods</th>
<th>Social Values</th>
<th>Socioeconomic outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Happiness</td>
<td>Sustenance</td>
<td>Basic economic essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Economic security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Equal opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect, acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Justice</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Commutative justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Productive justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What these schools of thought failed to recognize was that development could also be understood as being “value-loaded and value-based, involving value judgment in terms of both quality and quantity” (Bava, 2004, p. 128). Oommen (2002) suggests that alternate development approaches make it increasingly important, yet also impossible, to establish universally acceptable development indices. For example, a country’s development ranking changes depending on whether it is measured against indices of human development, human freedom, or human distress. Similarly, not all indices use the same indicators (e.g., gross national product or gross domestic product, education levels or literacy rates, health options or health care access) or weigh the indicators in the same way (e.g., White, 2008). All of the variations make it difficult to agree whose version of development should be adopted.

In line with dependency theories, other alternative development theories continued to push for a deeper appreciation of the inequality between central and peripheral development forces (Degnbol-Martinussen & Engberg-Pedersen, 2003). Inspired by revolutionary scholars such as Marx, Fanon, Freire, and Foucault, development theories broadened to include a variety of locally relevant factors, goals, instruments, methods, and meanings (McMicheal, 2010). The idea of “bottom-up” development became popular at this time. The typical “top-down” development approaches relied on central decision-making bodies, universal standards and processes, and state led controls. In contrast, bottom-up or “grass-root” initiatives sought to place decision-making and practical powers in the hands of local communities. This type of alternative development, suggests Friedmann (1992), resulted in development policy and action that sought to undermine the role of the state, assumed the infallibility of “the
people,” and emphasized community action (i.e., social action) at the expense of political engagement. Transitioning power from the top (centre) to the bottom (periphery) was thought to ensure relevant development policy, practical development efforts, and meaningful development outcomes.

In theory, bottom-up development provided a mechanism for altering the traditional power balance. In practice, it was heavily criticized for simply replicating the same power balance farther down the development hierarchy. Parnwell (2008) summarizes this position, stating that “pre-existing structures, such as in the distribution of political power, economic and asset wealth or in gender relations, are very difficult to wish away by the best intentions of grass-roots activists, and indeed, may become reinforced by their activities” (p. 114). Friedmann (1992) identifies another major flaw in this theoretical approach. Bottom-up theory, he argues, provides too narrow a focus. While it is important to consider the local, it is erroneous to act as if there were no real connection between the local and its broader context.

Potter, Binns, Elliot, and Smith (2004) identify three central elements amongst alternative development theories: self-reliance, bottom-up or grassroots movement, and a script for how development should be. As a whole, alternative development theories made two significant contributions to modern development. First, they established development as a multidimensional endeavour. Alternative development theories prompted development policy and practice that consider a broader range of issues (e.g., poverty vs. growth) and interventions (e.g., education and economy vs. economy). They

---

12 It is the projection of “how development should be” that unites the broader field of alternative development theories, in that they project action and thought that is counter to the norm.
also strengthened the challenge to traditional power structures by encouraging greater attention to local concerns, contexts, and practices. Second, alternative theories changed development aid delivery. Alternative development theories promoted more flexible development responses to meet local needs, and address issues of local autonomy and influence. Thus, there is a direct link between the prominence of alternative development theories and a rise in the number of, and funding to, non-government development organizations (Fowler, 1998; Pieterse, 1998).\(^\text{13}\)

While alternative development did address deficiencies in one-dimensional development theories, they did not solve development issues. Instead, they drew further attention to the complexity of development. As the theoretical promises of grass-roots development were not matched by experience, it became apparent that more thought needed to be given to how local communities fit within the broader development landscape and what should count as meaningful participation in establishing development practices and evaluating development outcomes.

### 2.2.4. Participatory Development

By the mid-1980s, participatory development moved from being one of several alternative development theories to the dominant development theory (Harris, 1997).\(^\text{14}\) Participatory development accepts that there are cultural, organizational, and individual differences that must be accounted for when initiating, managing, or evaluating development activities. Just as important, it acknowledges “participation” as essential to the legitimacy and, therefore, probability of success of any development strategy or plan.

---

\(^{13}\) The increase in NGDO was also aided by a parallel wave in neoclassical economic theory (Rapley, 2007, Chapt. 4-5).

\(^{14}\) Hickey and Mohan (2004) provide a selective history of participatory development stretching back to the 1940s.
(Nelson & Wright, 1995). For its advocates, participatory development offers effectiveness and efficiency, mutual learning, and transformation (Mohan, 2008). For its opponents, however, participatory development is no more than palatable redressing of top-down, colonialist tyranny (e.g., Cooke & Kothari, 2001).

At the heart of the participatory development debate is the struggle to define participation. Defining participation, notes Mohan (2008), “is more than an academic exercise…. [it is] central to its possible impact” (p. 46). Parfitt (2002) identifies four general definition categories:

a. Participation as voluntary contribution to state-led development programming, without the expectation of shaping or criticizing the program;

b. Participation in rural development as involvement in program decision-making, implementation, evaluation and benefit sharing;

c. Participation as increased control over resources and regulatory institutions by marginalized populations;

d. Community participation in which beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of development programs with a view to enhanced well-being.

He goes on to note, “while these definitions of participation are not mutually exclusive, it would be fair to say that statements (a) and (c) represent radically different approaches” (p. 147). Category (a) depicts participation as a means. It assumes that the intended end and chosen method of development are both personally meaningful and socially desirable to the participants. While this may be the case, it not hard to imagine, or to demonstrate (e.g., Cooke, 2004), that externally derived development programs run a real risk of delivering externally valued outcomes. Category (c) identifies participation as an end. It
suggests that it is not enough for local populations simply to participate in achieving a pre-determined goal, through a pre-established process, they must be active in all aspects of the process. This latter view has become the most dominant (e.g., Chambers, 2010).

The central questions of participatory development are: who should participate and in what way? Participation as a means provides organizations and institutions (the top) with primary decision-making and implementation responsibilities. Local persons (the bottom), therefore, are free to participate in a given initiative only. Participation as an end, however, cast a wider set of responsibilities for various organizations, institutions, and local actors to engage in the initial decision-making process, as well as the implementation phase. Here again, we are faced with issues of power and (in)equality. For example, participation as a means can mask the power dynamics that are inherent to any social space (Gaventa, 2004), while participation as an end draws attention to power dynamics by placing various groups at the centre of the development (Parfitt, 2002).

Regardless of the approach to participation, power and empowerment are integral to the various definitions of participatory development.15 Nelson and Wright (1995) identify three foundational models of power at play. The first, “power to”, builds on a concept of development as limitless growth. Here, the development or empowerment of an individual or group is not seen to limit the development of others (e.g., Deneulin, 2006). The second, “power over”, expresses a finite view of power. Empowerment, therefore, is the product of a redistribution of power in the form of control. Thus, more power for one group means less for another (e.g., Crawford, 2003). These two types of

15 Drawing on Parfitt (2002): just because (c) demands empowerment and (a) does not does not mean that (a) dismisses the importance of power.
power view power as an objective entity, which can be attributed to individuals or institutions in and of themselves. In the former case, power is expanded though self awareness and collaboration. In the latter case, power dynamics has a coercive tendency. The third concept offers a subjective or “decentred” notion of power. Here, power is “an apparatus consisting of discourse, institutions, actors and a flow of events” (p. 10). In this case, any kind of directive power is attributed retrospectively to any number of important but not necessarily intentional events (e.g., Kingdon, 1995).

The participatory process, notes Desai (2008), can be broken down into two parts: “a decision-making process and an action process to realize the objective decided upon” (p. 116). Robert Chambers’ work on participatory rural appraisal (1984, 1997, 2005) provides a touchstone for both (Campbell, 2002). Building on notions of power centres and peripheries, he suggests that development, and therefore the parameters of participation, must be driven by those most affected. Chambers’ early work focuses on knowledge, calling for a role reversal that places “local experts,” rather than “outsider professionals,” at the centre of development practices in general, and development evaluation in particular. Outsiders, he argues, poses a number of conscious and subconscious biases, which can both impede and confound development objectives (1984). His later work has expanded to include power dynamics. Adopting the top-bottom metaphor, Chambers argues for participation as a means to grassroots empowerment (2005).

Chambers’ work, though popular, is also polarizing. His most ardent challenges stem from his consistent, though admittedly inadvertent, depoliticizing of participation

---

16 A fuller discussion of Chambers methods can be found in Chapter Three.
Chambers’ approach makes participatory development more widely accessible. It also oversimplifies the often complicated reality. For this reason, Hickey and Mohan (2004) liken Chambers’ work to a “‘benign virus’ of participation spreading through institutions” (p. 161). They argue that Chambers’ emphasis on personal empowerment through personal ownership of development evaluation provides a limited account of the significance of cultural structures or institutional controls that influence personal action.\footnote{Chambers (2005), in discussing future directions, does acknowledge the political implications of participatory development, and participatory evaluation in particular.}

For its detractors, there are two options for addressing the shortcomings of participatory development. The soft option, as put forth by Hickey and Mohan (2004), is to transform participation from a token gesture to a true act of citizenship. In this context, Cornwall and Gaventa (2000) define citizenship as a political process of transforming passive development consumers into active citizens with equality based rights and opportunity to participate in institutions that affect their daily lives. The methodologies proposed earlier are needed more than ever. So are new lines of thinking: to complement rights of the poorer and weaker with obligations of the richer and more powerful, worldwide and between all levels; to recognize power and relationships as central issues; to realism; to think for oneself and take responsibility; to choose words and identity priorities for oneself; and to seek guidance by reflecting on what a poor person would wish one to do. (Chambers, 2005, p. 198)
circumstance. The hard option, as discussed in the next section, views all iterations of participation as no more than a redressing of historical tyrannies (e.g., Cooke & Kothari, 2001).

2.2.5. Post-Development

Pieterse (2000) argues that post-development, along with “anti-development” and “beyond development”, theories is a radical reaction to development dilemmas. With roots in post-modern, post-structural, and ecological movements (Parfitt, 2002; Pieterse, 2000), post-development thinking primarily emerges from Latin American scholarship and experience (Berg, 2007; Mathews, 2004). At the heart of this theory is the idea that accepting the terms “developed” and “undeveloped” places most people on earth to new social categories, creating, and inevitably widening, a gap between the centre and the margin.

Post-development draws heavily, though often without reference, on the discursive philosophy of Foucault (Brigg, 2002). It challenges, what Esteva and Prakash (1998) call, the “sacred cows” of development: globalization, universal human rights, and the individual self. These efforts in cow tipping seek to re-establish the legitimacy of local thinking, knowledge, and action (e.g., Sachs, 1992).

Wolfgang Sachs (1992), a founding advocate of the post-development critique, reaches a similar, albeit more poetic, conclusion:

The idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape. Delusion and disappointment, failures and crimes have been the steady companions of development and they tell a common story: it did not work… The authors of this book consciously bid farewell to the defunct idea in order to clear our minds for fresh discoveries. (p. 1)

Its introduction to African development has been slow and sporadic (Berg, 2007). In this context, development critiques tend toward the post-colonial (e.g., Crush, 1995).
Moving one step further, post-development also challenges the legitimacy of institutionalized power. Institutional power, such as those held by the World Bank, is said to be intentional, not constitutive (Havel, 1997; Smith, 1999). There is a general consensus, notes Escobar (2000), “to accept the poststructuralist insight about the importance of language and meaning in the creation of reality. This is a valid epistemological choice that has political consequence” (p. 12). One of these consequences is the rejection of human rights as morally neutral. Naturalized morality, argues Escobar (2000), should not be mistaken as a universal truth. Rather, it should be viewed cautiously as an attempt to domesticate local sensitivities and to serve those in power.\footnote{Globalization provides a lens for appreciating this type of communal existence (e.g., McGregor, 2007; Nederveen Pieterse, 1996). Globalization is often divided into two streams: ideology and process. As an ideology, globalization commonly refers to Western neo-liberal consumptive capitalism (e.g., Gur'Ze-ev, 2005). As a process, it reflects the natural borderless connection and interaction between people, politics, and their environment (Stiglitz, 2006; Urry, 2007). Therefore, a process of globalization recognizes that we do not exist in isolation, but with others.}

The main strength of post-development theory is its emphasis on critique. However, what it lacks is any sort of viable alternative to development (Kiely, 1999; Pieterse, 2000; Storey, 2000). Post-development theory tends to present an over-generalized view of development (Escobar, 2000). It suggests that all development efforts subscribe to a set of unified strategies and institutions.

Parfitt (2002) also takes issues with, what he sees as, the logical consistency of three key theoretical post-development assertions. First, post-development theory tends to make contradictory epistemological claims as it attempts to argue for relativism at the same time as it makes normative assertions. Pointing to key authors he writes:
Escobar embraced a relativist approach to the effect that power determines knowledge in order to dismiss truth claims…. However, he recoiled from this position when he realized that such a stance left him unable to make any truth claims in favour of his preferred post-development discourse. Similarly, Esteva and Prakash take a relativist stance to invalidate Northern development interventions in the South, but fall into a morass of analytic conclusion when they refuse to accept that it prevents them from making cross-cultural judgments also. (pp. 36-37)

Second, in trying to avoid the relativist trap of nihilism, post-development theory trades the periphery for centre and reintroduce modernist thinking through a new metanarrative (see Rahnema on “vernacular society”). However, this approach seems at odds with Pieteres (2000) argument for post-development as a rejection of modernism. Third, the notion of personal transformative agency becomes problematic when trying to locate the motivation and mechanism of change in the absence of social history and accountability (see Cowan & Shenton on “trusteeship”). In other words, while post-development calls for a rejection of Northern interference in expressions of Southern agency, its constructive attempts continue (perhaps inescapably) to be formed in the wake of Northern ideas and process. Nonetheless, in spite of its shortcomings, post-development theory remains a provocative approach to exploring and exposing the issues of development power and empowerment.

---

23 Cowen and Shenton (1996) define trusteeship as: “the intent that is expressed by one source of agency, to develop capacities of another. It is what binds the process of development to the intent of development” (p. x).
2.2.6. Development as Freedom

Confronted by a growing number of normative instabilities, development theory in the 1990s, expanded toward clearer explanations of the philosophic postulates on which the various development theories stood. The predominant focus on development ethics, notes Crocker (1991), was linked to: a growing list of ethical dilemmas in development practice, changes in development theory, the emergence of development praxis, the end of ethically neutral science and technology, and the need to reengage Western philosophy in matters of social importance. Distinct from the post-development approach, development ethics challenges practitioners, theorists, and participants to rethink (Qizilbash, 1996) or engage more reflexively (Pieterse, 1998, 2001) with the concept of development.24

Sen’s Development as Freedom (1999) is as one of the most comprehensive examples of this philosophical approach to development.25 Development as freedom, writes Sen, is “concerned with the processes of decision making as well opportunities to achieve valued outcomes” (p. 291). It is not about ends or means (as participatory development suggests) but about ends and means.26 It is both a process of expanding the real freedoms that people have access to, and the actual freedoms they enjoy. As Sen explains, freedom “makes our lives richer and more unfettered, but also allows us to be

24 Development ethics seeks: “to diagnose vital problems facing human societies, to guide public policy choices, and to clarify value dilemmas surrounding these problems and policies (Goulet, 1997, p. 1167).
25 Development as Freedom (Sen, 1999) draws together ideas from a number of Sen’s works on issues such as: equality (1980), poverty and famine (1981), human rights (1985), and justice (1990). Critical to this approach is the acknowledgement of positive (freedom to) and negative (freedom from) freedoms.
26 Sen refers to this conjunction as the constitutive and instrumental roles of freedom (1999, pp. 36-37).
fuller social persons, exercising our own volitions and interacting with – and influencing -- the world in which we live”(p. 15).

Sen offers development as freedom as an alternative view on human justice. Several of his previous works attack the standard development evaluative principles of utilitarianism (John Stuart Mill), libertarianism (Roberk Novak) and Rawlsian justice (John Rawls) (e.g., Sen, 1970, 1983,1985,1990). Whereas it points toward the actual results of action and the importance of well-being, utilitarianism falls short with regards to distributive equality; is silent on rights, freedoms, and non-utility concerns; and is susceptible to social adaptation and conditioning. Libertarianism places an unwavering emphasis on rights, and, in particular the right to. Emphasizing action without regard for consequence, Sen argues, provides too limited a base for justice. Rawlsian justice presents a different sort of problem. Sen does not disagree with liberty as an essential component of justice. However, he does take exception to its being of primary importance. Whereas Rawls sets out to identify universally acceptable primary and secondary elements of justice, Sen prefers a more fluid approach. For Sen, elements of justice cannot be established a priori.27

Freedom, argue Sen, cannot be assigned in general terms. It must be individually defined. Whereas Rawls and Mill provided universal norms, Sen asks that each person or society derive its own norms based on its evaluation of capabilities and functions. Sen (1993) defines functions as “parts of the state of person -- in particular the various things that he or she manages to do or be in leading a life” (p. 31). Individual functions combine to provide functioning vectors. These vectors combine to provide capability

sets -- “the alternative combinations of functionings that are feasible for [a person] to achieve” (Sen, 1999, p. 75). Ultimately, one must, in charting one’s actual course of action or being, choose between relevant capability sets. This said, not all capabilities are equal. It is not enough for someone simply to be able to choose between sets. The measure of any capability set is linked to one’s opportunities for meaningful choices regarding how to live. As Sen explains:

The assessment of capabilities has to proceed primarily on the basis of observing a person’s actual functionings, to be supplemented by other information. There is a jump here (from functionings to capabilities) but it need not be a big jump, if only because the valuation of actual functionings is one way of assessing how a person values the options she has. (1999, p 131)

In so far as capabilities are based on the functionings that an individual truly values, they are a kind of freedom.

Sen’s works focus predominantly on individual freedom. However, he does make a point of acknowledging the importance of social conscious. On the one hand, he acknowledges that freedom must reflect what one personally values as function and chooses as capability. On the other hand, he accepts that these values and choices are influenced by social factors (Sen, 1993). Mathias and Teresa (2006) call this the plural-singular principle: the person is a condition of plurality such that any personal action or choice (i.e., freedom) must not be exercised without consideration of its implications for
others. Therefore, with an increased level of individual freedom comes an increased level of social responsibility.\textsuperscript{28}

Development as freedom has enriched the range of considerations regarding human well-being. It also presents a number of troubling features (Gasper, 2003). Challenges to development as freedom are decidedly directed towards its theoretical foundations, rather than its practical applications. These challenges come mainly in the form of concept ambiguity (see Cohen, 1993; Nussbaum, 2000; Prendergast, 2005; Sugden, 2006; Qizilbash, 2002), rationality and choice (see Putnam, 1993; Walsh, 2008), and, to a lesser extent, paternalism (see Deneulin, 2002). To a certain extent these challenges are related. Sen’s affinity for an Aristotelian ethics creates a development theory that is intentionally broad (1999). Therefore, theoretical clarity primarily exists at the macro level. Any pragmatic approach to development as freedom becomes necessarily arduous. Freedom, writes Sen, “is not so much a matter of having exact rules about how precisely we ought to behave, as of recognizing the relevance of our shared humanity in making the choices we face” (p. 283).

Sen’s work provides a strong example of the essential link between development (qua economics) and ethics (Walsh, 2003). However, Martins (2007) suggest that the real value of Sen’s development as freedom is its ontological foundation. While Sen does not directly acknowledge the ontology of freedom, his work begins with ontological questions (e.g., “what is equality?”, what is capability?”, or “what is development?”). It is

\textsuperscript{28} Sen (1999) argues:

\begin{quote}
without the substantive freedom and capability to do something, a person cannot be responsible to do it. But actually having the freedom and capability to do something does impose on the person the duty to consider whether to do it or not, and this does involve individual responsibility. (p. 284)
\end{quote}
only by answering these questions, argues Martins, that Sen can address ethical questions for which his theory is most noted.\textsuperscript{29} Sen’s work is more than an ethical declaration on human development. Development as freedom presents an example of an integrated philosophic view on who we are as humans and then, by extension, on what we should do with respect to human development (e.g., Nussbaum, 2000; Pressman & Summerfield, 2002).

2.2.7. Development Partnership\textsuperscript{30}

In the current development aid system, writes Fowler (2000), “…only one type of relationship seems to count. It is called ‘partnership’” (p. 1). Reference to development partnership, however, can be found in various aid policies and non-government

\textsuperscript{29} Martins (2007) writes:

The answer to the questions of the form ‘what is the object?’ help in finding the answer to the question ‘what should be done?’, but the former are nevertheless ontological questions, and must be combined with a prescriptive criterion before answering ethical questions such as ‘what should be done?’ Ontological questions and the insight achieved can of course figure in ethical theorizing, but this does not change the fact that Sen’s capability approach, insofar as it was primarily aimed at clarifying the nature of ‘well-being’ and ‘advantage’ (using the ontological notions of functioning and capability), is essentially an ontological contribution, not an ethical one (p. 42).

\textsuperscript{30} It may be contentious to some, to consider partnership as a development theory: unlike the previously presented theories, it does not have any essential texts or authors. The weight of this assertion stems from the prevalence of the term in national and international development policy and the growing body of multidisciplinary research addressing partnership in its various manifestations. Examples of the current currency of partnership include its inclusion: in the Millennium Development Goals (United Nations), and in the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), as critical to the mission of the World Bank, as a branch of the Canadian International Development Agency, and as key program for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. Partnership research can be found in a variety of journals on management, business ethics, development, law, philosophy, public administration, and international relations. It can also be found as part of the discourse on participatory development (e.g., Chambers, 2005), global governance (e.g., Buse & Harmer, 2009), and organizational change (e.g., Ebrahim, 2006).
organization documents beginning around the 1970s (Barnes & Brown, 2011; Fowler, 2000). The widespread acceptance of partnership is attributed to a number of convergent factors. Tracing these factors gives some insight into what can be viewed as two complimentary, but distinct, interpretations of partnership. Building on the ideas of Sen, the different perceptions are expressed as a constitutive and instrumental definition of partnership. Furthermore, differentiating between constitutive and instrumental forms of partnership provides a useful frame for exploring key issues and challenges to engaging in, and ultimately benefiting from development partnerships.

Fowler (2000) identifies four central events leading to the emergence of development partnership. First, changes in macro-economic policy saw a dramatic shift in the way aid funding was distributed and managed. As discussed previously, by the 1980s domestic and foreign economic policy of Northern countries pointed toward market-rather than government-led economic growth (Rapley, 2007). Though development relationships were not a focus of this policy, structural adjustment economic policies signaled an increase in “donor-led” development. Second, the end of the Cold War and the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union gave rise to unstable geopolitical relations. In this new era, North-South relations could not be established based on the notion of strategic advantage. As such, notes Barnes and Brown (2011), many of the policy elites no longer saw the need to maintain the same level of foreign aid. Government withdrawal also opened a new space for private interest, and forced non-government development organizations [NDGO] to seek a new justification for their work.
A third factor in the transition to partnership was the increased frustration of NGDOs: “Experience of having their local development efforts undermined by ill-conceived policies and often poor, corrupt national public management, caused them to shift their horizons to policy formation and its actors at home and abroad” (Fowler, 2000, p. 2). These efforts were heavily influenced by participatory and rights-based development thinking, movements that were already sympathetic to the language of partnership. The final factor that led to the universal adoption of partnership was the increased number of relationships between NGDOs and market actors. In the wave of globalization that followed from structural adjustment, transnational organizations took on the role of “colonial oppressor” formerly worn by government (Barnes & Brown, 2011). Under the rubric of corporate social responsibility, many of these organizations cultivated closer connections with Northern and Southern NDGOs. By the late 1990s these factors began to converge more forcefully. As Fowler (2000) notes: “They have given way to complex relational arenas of intensive and extensive interaction between governments, business, and civic institutions in the North and South around developing agendas, where the rules of the game are being made up on the spot” (p. 3).

Barnes and Brown (2011) identify two primary attractors for adopting partnership as part of a mainstream development agenda. In the broadest sense, partnership provides a new narrative for development. In breaking from traditional bifurcated development relationships, such as North-South, donor-recipient, developed-developing (see Baaz, 2004), partnership alludes to a certain level of equality, underscored by the idea of cooperation. A flexible partnership narrative permits multiple interpretations and allows
various interests and actors to find common (though often ambiguous) ground in a new era of development policy. In particular write Barnes and Brown (2011):

…partnership served… as a way to balance or ‘bridge’ at least two competing perspectives about the future governance of aid. On the one hand, it could satisfy the ‘neoliberal’ concern about the perpetual connection between ‘welfare aid’, corruption and recipient ineffectiveness. On the other hand, it could satisfy many critical voices about the need for a more socially just system, which would address lingering issues of paternalism, neocolonialism and economic inequality (p. 172).³¹

Over a decade into the partnership era, it appears that support for this amorphous concept may be waning. Though partnership remains a central piece of development policy and corporate social responsibility directives, it is spoken with a healthy dose of skepticism, even cynicism (e.g., Crawford, 2003; Martella & Schunk, 1997; Reed & Reed, 2009; Reith, 2010; de Schweinitz et al., 2009; Seyner, 2000; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Tedrow & Mabokela, 2007; Tomlinson, 2008; Utting & Zammit, 2009). As our understanding of partnership oscillates between universal acceptance and contempt, Brinkerhoff (2002) argues: “partnership is in danger of remaining a ‘feel good’ panacea for [development] without a pragmatic grasp of what it is and how it differs from business as usual” (p. 20).

There is no lack of literature relating to development partnership. There is, however, little consensus on what partnership is. Morse and McNamara (2006) classify

³¹ By way of third prominent perspective, Whaites (1999) makes an equally convincing argument for the affinity between Christian values, development evangelism, and partnership.
this body of investigation into four predominant analytic frameworks: a) Power relations (Lister, 2000), b) Discourse (Hastings, 1999), c) Interdependence (Banthem, Celuch, & Kasouf, 2003), and d) Function/Performance (Brinkerhoff, 2002). Their cross-analytic study of North-South partnerships in Nigeria highlights the contrasting and complimentary information sets focused on by each framework: equality, learning, time, and role and expectation clarity, respectively. In what rings as a somewhat hollow but consistent refrain (e.g., Banda, Jeanes, Kay & Lindsay, 2008; Demenet, 2001; Johnson & Wilson, 2006; Mommers & van Wessel, 2009; Pickard, 2007; O’Sullivan, 2010), the final discussion offered by Morse and McNamara implies that while each framework makes a pragmatic contribution to the partnership analytic, the meaning and measure of “true” partnership remains elusive.\textsuperscript{32}

2.3. Framing the Issue

Each development theory paints a picture of who we are with respect to development. With modernization, we are considered to be universally the same, motivated by the same forces and moving along the same (economic) trajectory. Development, therefore, should be directed and delivered by those most advanced along the trajectory. Dependency theory did not argue, necessarily, with our characterization as universally the same, but it did take exception to the explanation and process of economic advancement. The shift to alternative development theories, however, challenged more openly the fundamental premise of our universality. In pushing development practice beyond a single economic focus, it also advocated for bottom-up development initiatives.

\textsuperscript{32} Searching for a conclusion, Morse and McNamara (2006) offer the words of one of the study’s participants: “Perhaps the best measure of partnership is when both partners realize that they miss each other” (p. 334)
Alternative development theories challenged both the notion of universality and the measure of natural progression. Motivated by power differentials, it questioned ownership of the mechanisms, as well as the targets of development. Participatory development theories build on this. They argue that we are not essentially equal, that difference in resource control, procedural control, and knowledge point to significant differences in how we view ourselves. While post-development suggests that these differences are too great and that we should scrap the idea of collaborative development, development as freedom urges us to openly engage in these differences and work through the difficulties of identifying what, if anything, we can agree upon in terms of pursuing or exercising our freedom as human beings.

Development partnership provides a theoretical foundation broad enough to appeal to a wide range of development stakeholders. It is also vague enough that the majority of these stakeholders fails to see the difference between partnership and other development relationships. At the heart of development partnership are principles of equality, mutuality, and cooperation. However, at the same time that they about equality, development stakeholders recognize that we are not the same. Stakeholders come to the table with different levels of expertise, resources, and capabilities. Therefore, the primary challenge for partners is to reconcile their real differences in light of their essential equality.

Development partnership provides us with an opportunity to look beyond the usual set of pragmatic development considerations. Partnership draws explicit attention to the relationship between development participants. It also makes explicit ethical demands on these participants. However, if development participants maintain a
complacent attitude towards social theory and its philosophical foundations then they will continue to struggle to understand the gap between partnership theory and practice. Moreover, they will continue to ask what is partnership, when they should be asking who are we as partners?

2.3.1. Social Theory as Practice

Taylor (1983) argues that Western society has become complacent in its understanding and use of theory, and social theory in particular. He identifies two types of theory: natural science theory and social science theory. As the names suggest, each type of theory is best suited for a particular type of experience. However, argues Taylor, there is a general movement in Western thought to confront social experience with natural science theory. Such an approach, he suggests, is deeply problematic because natural science theory makes assumptions that are unsubstantiated by social experience.

Both natural science and social science theory seek to articulate what is really going on, albeit from fundamentally different perspectives. Natural science theory provides an explanation of events by identifying the underlying mechanisms that drive

---

33 Taylor (1989) writes:

This is the striking disanalogy between natural science and [social] theories. That latter can undermine, strengthen or shape the practice that they bear on. And that is because a) they are theories about practice, which b) are partly constituted by certain self-understanding. To that extent that c) theories transform this self-understanding, they undercut, bolster or transform the constitutive features of practice. We could put this another way by saying that political theories are not about independent objects in the way that theories are in the natural science. Here, the relation of knowledge to practice is that one applies what one knows about the causal powers to particular cases, but the truths about such causal powers that one banks on are thought to remain unchanged. That is the point of saying that theory here is about an independent object. In politics, on the other hand, accepting a theory can itself transform what that theory bears on. (p.12)
the causal properties of some thing. It provides a framework for instrumental reasoning formed from observation of *external* events. Social science theory provides an understanding of the activity (or activities) that is central to a practice, and articulates the norms that are essential to this practice. It provides a framework for normative reasoning based on the interpretation of *internal* events. In other words, natural science theory explains what things are and do; social science theory captures who we are. Therefore, if we treat human experience like “thing experience”, then we are neglecting both subjective origins of these experiences and the transformative potential of expanded self-understanding.

This distinction has implications for development partnership. If we approach partnership theory as a natural science theory, we assume that each partner is essentially the same: motivated by the same things, responsive in the same manner, focused on the same ends. This approach provides us with a set of partnership characteristics, but does not allow for various interpretations. On the other hand, approaching development partnership as a social science theory, we are forced to consider different possibilities or ways of being. This approach does not negate the possibility of normative partnership theories. It is to be expected that different groups will attribute common features to a shared relationship. What this approach does do is require us to explore the specific ways in which these characteristics are manifested. It is also expected that social theory will challenge and potentially change the way that we understand and engage in partnership. Social theory, as it relates to self-understanding, has the ability to transform practice by altering our self-description and probing into our identity.
2.3.2. Identity

The question of “who we are?” is a question of identity. Under the gaze of economic and neo-Marxist development perspectives (power), argues Baaz (2004), identity is often viewed as a reflection of more broadly defined relationships. It is, however, more significant that, “the meanings and workings of identity have their own dynamics and cannot be read merely as a reflection of unequal economic relations” (p. 2). As organizations broaden their exposure to a wider range of stakeholders, exploring identity is critical to achieving better understanding of and, perhaps, more effective and efficient relationships (Tomlinson, 2008). Understanding identity (e.g., the aid worker, the expert, the local, government, the corporation, the undeveloped, the partner), however, requires more than a role description or list of traits. It requires a deeper exploration of the implications and interactions between the how we view our selves and what we do.

Identity As a Philosphic Construct

Our identity, argues Taylor (1989), is manifested in the interaction between our ontological self (what I am) and our ethical self (what I do).[^34] Taken together, these dimensions of self-hood allow us to frame the most fundamental of human questions: who am I? The answer to this question demands consideration of both who I am at this moment (a contemporary-historical analysis) and who I may be (future projection). This

[^34]: Ontology is the philosophic study of human being. The central question for ontology is what is it to be human?, or what does it mean to be human? Ethics (synonymous with morality) is the philosophic study of human behaviour. The central question for ethics is: what should we do? In recent popular works, both philosophic and non-philosophic, notes Marquez (2005), ethics has been emphasized at the expense of ontology. Doing so, argues Taylor and others (e.g., Nietzsche, Heidegger) artificially limits our self-understanding.
particular trajectory is underpinned by a system of values and valuation, such that I understand who I am and who I may be with respect to what I consider to be right or good. In short, each human being has an operational or identity framework (what I am and what I value), which when articulated serves to clarify (in the moment) and transform (in projecting towards a future self) his self.\textsuperscript{35}

Articulated or not, our identity framework (or moral ontology) serves “to provide the basis for discriminations about appropriate objects or valid responses” (Taylor, 1989, p. 9). An identity framework allows human beings to a) distinguish good from bad, or right from wrong behaviour and b) make a distinction between the self and the other. It gives shape to how we view our self and construct relationships. What is unique about Taylor’s view of identity frameworks is not that he identifies a) and b) as the constituent elements of identity, but that he emphasizes their mutual dependence.\textsuperscript{36} Understanding who we are requires us to explore the link between what we value (ethics) and how we relate to other (ontology).

Ethics is an ontological condition of our being human: we are agents who evaluate. It marks a higher class of values that we adopt in order to be good (Taylor, 1989). At first glance, certain ethical principles (e.g., murder is wrong) can appear to be universal. However, such ethical principles are not universal in the sense that they can be

\textsuperscript{35} While arguments made here are directed towards individuals, the same philosophical principles are valid within a various social or organizational structures (e.g., Tomlinson, 2008).

\textsuperscript{36} There has been a recent trend in Western philosophy and social theory to separate ethics from ontology and focus on the former at the expense of the later (Balazs, 2004; Jodoin, 2008; Martins, 2007; Taylor, 2003). This separation has been facilitated, in part, by an overly narrow view of ontology, which sees it a) as totalizing force that artificially limits our capacity for self-definition (e.g., Foucault, Derrida) or b) as ultimately beyond proof and therefore unworthy of serious attention (see Smith, 1982).
objectively validated. Rather, they become universalized through social interaction and cultural normalization. In other words, ethical principles become universal because we universalize them. Establishing universal ethics becomes challenging when we consider that each ethical claim can be arrived at from any number of different ontological positions and can lead to any number of practices. For example, through b) we come to define what we are in relation to our environment: we know the self with respect to the other. In other words, to be is to be in relation to someone or something. Post-modern philosophy draws particular attention to the relationship between the Self and the Other in articulating our ontology: what I am (the Self) emerges in relation to what I am not (the Other). Our ontological stance is not given, but is developed over time through the interaction of particular Selfs with particular Others.

A comparison of the moral ontology outlined by Sartre and Heidegger illustrates how different Self-Other relationships incite different understandings of and actions regarding freedom. For Sartre (1956), the Other is a limiting agent who, by engaging with the Self (through observation or definition), stifles its possibility for being. In short, the Self struggles for self-definition, or to establish its identity against the imposing definition offered by the Other. In practice, the Other awakens, in the Self, a sense of shame. Therefore, freedom is valued as an escape from shame and as a refusal to be constrained by external limitations. Heidegger (1962), on the other hand, identifies the Other as an agent of care. Here, the Self/Other dichotomy is less confrontational. The Other does not stand against the Self, but with it. As such, the relationship between the

---

37 Parfitt (2002) defines post-modern as “a reaction against [the] central elements of modernity, particularly metatheory, foundationalism, and subject-object relations…wherein the subject is allocated an over-powerful position in the relation to the object” (p. 21).
Self and the Other is not one of indifference (does not matter), but one of intent (matters in a particular way). In this way freedom for the Self is valued in that it also brings freedom to the Other.

This link between ethics and ontology is also important to development theory. Modernization theory (e.g., Rostow, 1960) adopts the ontological stance that all humans are identical, though in different stages of development. Therefore, it is anticipated that development follows a single historical trajectory (from undeveloped to developed). It then follows that freedom is achieved when one breaks from undeveloped practices and moves upward along the path of development. In contrast, Sen (1999) provides an ontological foundation in which “I am similar to you” in a general sense (i.e., desire to develop) but distinct in various important ways (e.g., culture, gender, ability). Moreover, “I am connected to you” in a way that must recognize that my development has consequences for you that must be considered. Therefore, it is anticipated that my development is connected to but distinct from yours. For Sen, freedom is both the means and the end of development. It is pursued with respect to self-assertion, such that it expands or sustains my freedom, and social responsibility, in that “I account for my freedom” with respect to yours.

Another way to think of an identity framework is as a boundary. A boundary helps us to distinguish what is in and what is out. It is neither rigid (dogmatism at the extreme) nor elastic (relativism at the extreme). However, it is totalizing, in the sense that it encompasses all that I am. Ferré’s (1996) distinction between the universal and the
perfect helps to illustrate this last point. Something is universal in that all experience is filtered through it. Something is perfect in that it is not open to further, future, or alternative iteration. In this way, an identity framework provides a totalizing boundary in that all of our experience as filtered through it (rigid or universal), but the filter is open to change (elastic or imperfect).

Oommen (2002) identifies four general types of boundaries between the Self and the Other. Focusing on the ethical dimension of equality, his work demonstrates the reciprocal relationship between changes in ontology and ethical standards and applications (see Table 3). At one extreme, the Self and the Other are essentially equal such that the same ethical standards apply to both in the same way. At the other extreme, the Self and the Other are essentially unequally such that their respective ethical standards are incomparable. Oommen also identifies two boundary types that are open to great deal of ambiguity. Boundary type Self-Other relationship presents a special case in that both parties recognize the Self-Other relationship, but they do necessarily agree on the nature of the relationship. Similarly, there the parties share an ethical orientation, but differing opinions on its application. The task for development partners is to determine the discrepancy between the type of boundary (identity) they are operating within and the type within which they would prefer to operate.

[38] "If ever a ‘know it all’ attitude is radically inappropriate, it is when one is indeed trying to know the All” (Ferré, 1996, p. 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Morality</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>the Other is different from, but neither superior nor inferior, to the Self;</td>
<td>Same ethical standards</td>
<td>Canadian citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>the Other is “equal” but marginalized by the Self</td>
<td>Same ethical standards with permissible exceptions</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>the Other rejects evaluation given by the Self;</td>
<td>Ethical standards are in conflict</td>
<td>Punk Rocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside-Unequal</td>
<td>the Other is unequal and inferior to the Self</td>
<td>Beyond ethical standards</td>
<td>Alien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Conclusion: Development Theory, Partnership, and Identity

One of the biggest challenges for development theory is identifying or evaluating who should develop and how they should develop. Oommen (2002) argues that this challenge “is not one of identifying praxiological lags from a constructed ideal type but that of an essential theoretical gap” (p. 43). Barnes and Brown (2011) echo this point with respect to development partnership. The gap between development partnership theory and practice cannot be addressed through basic normative or instrumental approaches. Before we are critical of practice, we need to be clearer about theory. More specifically, we must be clearer about the philosophical principles of partnership and their practical implications. This chapter has explored several major shifts in development theories. Ending with development partnership, it has argued that partnership theory provides a superficial answer to several concerns that have arisen from previous development theories (i.e., equality, participation, holism), but fails to address the specific demands of social theory as a form of identity formation.

Social theory is a unique form of theory. It is unique in that it marks an attempt at self-definition. This act of self-definition works in two ways. It can either bring clarity to already acknowledged characteristics and actions, or seek to transform them. Identity, taken here as point of philosophic exploration, poses the question: who am I? Who I am is determined by the interaction of ontology and ethics. Accordingly, what I am cannot be separated from what I should do. Separating ethics from ontology (as has been the case in recent Western philosophy and development discourse) limits our ability to gain
theoretical clarity (e.g., what do I mean by equality?) and practical consistency (e.g., is what I am compatible with what I do?).\textsuperscript{39}

This study proposes that the current prominence of development partnership theory is more of an attempt at inspirational self-description than it is an attempt at explicit description of current practice. Furthermore, this change in theory is more than a shift in development practice: it is a challenge to our identity as development stakeholders. Therefore, this study adopts a philosophically grounded analysis of development partnership. Through a case study of TTASPE and its partners, the study seeks to provide: a) a better understanding of who TTASPE is as a development partner, and b) a theoretical model of development partnership that draws attention to the importance of identity.

\textsuperscript{39} Several authors note that attention to development ethics often comes at the expense of ontological clarity (e.g., Briggs, 2002; Martins; 2007; Pieterse, 1999; Radcliffe, 2006).
3. RESEARCH PROGRAM: THEORY BUILDING

Let us now cast an eye over the development of the theoretical system….

all knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it. Propositions arrived at by purely logical means are completely empty.…

(Einstein, 1954, p. 271)

The purpose of research is to expand or clarify our knowledge of a particular phenomenon. However, there is nothing to say that any particular phenomenon has to be researched in a particular way. For example, the effects of concussions, a phenomenon that is particularly popular in sport at the moment, can be studied through observing brain activity, monitoring behaviors or symptoms, first-person interviews, or directed artistic expression. The point is that the research approach is a matter of choice. What matters most in establishing a solid research program is that each choice is congruent with the others and that each choice serves to focus the particular type of insight gained from the investigation.

This research program identifies two main types of choices: philosophical (Hollis, 1993) and methodological (de Groot, 1969). Philosophical choices establish the researcher’s fundamental positions regarding knowledge (epistemology) and the primary unit of social reality (ontology). Methodological choices identify the practical research consideration (program, methodology, and methods) and should be a logical extension of philosophical research foundation. This chapter offers a detailed description of the choices and limitations that shape this study.

---

40 de Groot’s (1969) methodology remains relevant to recent research programs, particularly in relation to theory building (e.g., Malloy, 1992; Richters, 2011, Wright, 1982).
3.1. The Philosophy of Social Science

Before choosing a philosophical research perspective, it is important to identify the key philosophical research elements. In the social sciences, research philosophy is typically limited to epistemological considerations (e.g., Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996; Hughes & Sharrock, 1997; Thomas, Nelson, & Sliverman, 2005). However, Hollis (1994) suggests that this approach is too narrow. Epistemology, he argues, provides a strong point of distinction between research approaches in natural and social science, but it neglects the ontology of social interaction. Hollis concludes that sound social science research should address both the “pathway to truth” (i.e., epistemology) and the relationship between structure and action (i.e., ontology).

Epistemology is the philosophic inquiry into the foundation of knowledge. It provides a critical framework that allows the researcher to distinguish opinion from truth (Manicas, 2006). Historically, the terms explanation and understanding have been used interchangeably to describe the aim of scientific research. However, Hollis (1994) uses these terms to distinguish between two key epistemologies: explanation and understanding.

The purpose of explanation, argues Hollis (1994), “is to identify the relevant generalizations” (p. 62). This epistemological position is linked to empirical (in the natural sciences) or positive (in the social sciences) approaches to truth. Through this
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41 Ethical considerations are also important, but are addressed as part of the particular research methods and not the general research approach.
42 Taylor (1995, chapter 1) warns that epistemological differences should not be misconstrued as an inconsistent reasoning, but approached as contrasting concepts of the nature of, and pathway to, truth. In other words, epistemological differences cannot be adequately addressed by appealing to notions of more or less rational. The differences stem from their origins, or a priori statements on truth, and move forward under the shared mechanics of logic.
epistemology, truth is thought to exist beyond human influence, an object to be discovered. Guided by this epistemology, the researcher attempts to distance himself from any subjective influences. In doing so, he is able to amass a series of observations that, through inductive reasoning, allow him to reconstruct universal truths. Universal truths are formed through general laws. These laws outline a relationship of cause and effect. They also assume that the researcher has a priori knowledge of a particular truth. However, notes Manicas (2006), these laws are temporal and conditional. They describe what is, without necessarily being able to explain what will be. Therefore, reasoning is deductive, drawing on these general laws allows the researcher to approximate or influence future events, but does not guarantee specific outcomes.

In contrast, an epistemology of understanding rejects the idea of objective truth. Instead, understanding proposes that truth emerges with respect to our beliefs, values, and meaning (Hollis, 1994). This subjective approach to truth presents a challenge to the researcher: how can we account for someone else’s truth without imposing our own? Schwandt (2000) identifies two prominent responses to this challenge. Interpretivism encourages the researcher to acknowledge and neutralize his own subjective influences. In doing so, the researcher is able to provide an objective account of the other’s subjective truth. Hermeneutics suggests that it is impossible for the researcher to insulate his own truths from those of others. For this reason, truth emerges from a dialogue between the observer and the observed. Unlike explanation, understanding provides a description of current experiences and can guarantee future responses. The caveat to this latter ability is that subjective truth is open to change. Therefore, it is only able to guarantee outcomes so long as the subject truth remains constant.
Ontology, we are reminded, refers to state of being or the relationship between the Self and the Other. From a research perspective, the Self-Other relationship is manifested in the link between structure and action. The research ontology allows the researcher to identify the effect one structure has on another. Hollis (1994) identifies two ontological frameworks: holism and individualism. Holism refers to any research approach that accounts for individual action by appealing to social systems or institutions. Individualism flips this relationship. It argues that individual agents affect social systems and influence institutional purposes and functions.

Hollis (1994) argues that sound research involves three elements: 1) identifying the key philosophical research concerns, 2) choosing a research paradigm, and 3) establishing research methods (see Figure 1: Social Science Research Matrix (Hollis, 1994)). He goes on to argue that, historically, social science research has only considered epistemology (i.e., “pathways to truth”) as a key philosophical concern. However, this approach is too narrow. Hollis suggests that philosophical concerns should also address ontology (i.e., the relationship between structure and action). Combining these elements, he identifies four research paradigms (see Error! Reference source not found.). With these concerns in mind, this study still has to choose which paradigm it will adopt and the methods it will employ.
Figure 1: Social Science Research Matrix (Hollis, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holism</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>“Games”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epistemology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Paradigm</th>
<th>Philosophic Perspective</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Explanation Holism</td>
<td>Natural truths correspond with systematic needs and functions; individual actions defer to pre-existing systems.</td>
<td>Modernization Theory, Dependency Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Explanation Individualism</td>
<td>Social truth is the product of individual desires; aggregated rational choice between ends and means defines system operations.</td>
<td>Neo-Liberalism, Structural Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Games”</td>
<td>Understanding Holism</td>
<td>Universal truths dictate individual behaviours, but are open to context-specific interpretations.</td>
<td>Human Rights, Participatory Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>Understanding Individualism</td>
<td>Truth can only be found through individual experience; understanding social interactions means understanding individual reality</td>
<td>Post-Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Philosophic Choices

Hollis’ (1994) research matrix (see Figure 1) helps to clarify the researcher’s philosophic research choices. However, the choices may not be as clear as the model implies. Hollis’ matrix draws clear distinctions between the philosophic research elements and their corresponding paradigms. Still, he makes the case that while this separation provides a useful tool for grappling with the complexity of scientific investigation in social settings, it masks the real potential for collaboration between the elements and their respective positions. After all, notes Wallerstein (2004), scientific research is informed by values (i.e., understanding) as much as it is by knowledge of efficient causes (i.e., explanation). Regardless of its graphic limitation, Hollis’ model identifies two fundamental research choices.

The first choice is epistemological. It is neither prudent nor desirable, argues Hollis (1994), to merge explanation and understanding. There is a fear that blending explanation with understanding will create an epistemological hybrid that renders the whole scientific process monstrously incomprehensible. However, by choosing one research epistemology the researcher does not deny the validity of the other. Rather, explanation and understanding should be viewed as two sides of the same coin, in which each stance works to inform and enhance the other. Taylor (1983) takes a similar view. He makes a distinction between natural and social sciences in order to urge researchers to consider the deeper implication of research epistemology. Recalling Taylor’s assertion that social theory is connected to our identity formation, and Barnes and Brown’s (2011)

---

43 “How far [should one] go in suggesting that social life is what it means?” (Hollis, 1994, p. 184)
44 See Plato’s Republic and Jane Jacobs’ Systems of Survival for complementary discussions of the dangers of blending.
contention that development partnership falls short in addressing the philosophic principles of its theory (see Chapter 2), I have chosen a research epistemology of understanding for this study.

The second choice is ontological. Hollis (1994) suggests the blending holistic and individualistic research perspectives may be beneficial; a closer look at theories within each research paradigm indicates that social experiences cannot be entirely explained by strict adherence to either holism or individualism. Recent studies in development partnership share this position (Curtis, 2004; Huijstee, Franken & Leroy, 2007). Taking partnership seriously, they argue, requires consideration of the interplay between institutions and actors. Therefore, this study adopts a blended ontological perspective. This choice directs the research to explore how institutions and individuals shape the development partnership experience.

3.3. Research Methodology and Methods

Yates (2004) identifies two different types of research processes. Survey research takes into account for “what is going on.” Experimental research seeks to control the environment and test specific responses to stimulus. de Groot (1969) combines these processes with philosophic research considerations, providing five basic research methodologies: 1) hypothesis testing—a single (or a few related) hypothesis is tested against empirical data (e.g., Burnett, 2001), 2) instrumental-nomological—a research instrument is constructed, standardized, or validated (e.g., Coatler, 2007), 3) descriptive— an explicitly stated systematic method is used to capture a phenomena, without anticipating a theory or hypothesis articulation (e.g., Willis, 2000), 4) exploratory—an
intermediate between descriptive and hypothesis testing (e.g., Lytras, 2007), and 5) theory-building.

Theory building is inherently interpretive. This type of research program is unique in that it does not rely on the collection of new data per se. A theory can be established based on any closed set of findings, ranging from a single subject to the entire history of a nation (de Groot, 1969). It is particularly valuable in circumstances where a problem cannot be solved through hypothesis testing. This limitation appears because the aim of a theoretical study, states de Groot, “[is to] find and establish relationships by means of tentative applications of, or derivations from, some theory or hypothesis—or concept, or view” (p. 309). In other words, its aim is not to prove, but to suggest.

This study uses descriptive research processes as part of a broader theory-building methodology. Before a theory is built, writes de Groot (1969), “a survey is needed of what objects and events are on hand, or are relevant—according to a specific systematic method—in a given area of the phenomenal world” (p. 305). Once this survey is complete, the researcher is able to suggest, or theorize about, the key relationships governing the experience in question.

Development partnership is well suited for theoretical study. The high level of theoretical and practical variation within the field makes hypothesis testing and instrumental-nomological verification highly problematic. Providing another description of development partnership adds little to the growing collection of partnership narratives, and the philosophical choices preclude an exploratory approach. A theoretical research program directs this study toward its objectives: providing an authentic description of development partnership (i.e., TTASPE and its partners) and generating a theoretical
model of the link between partnership and identity. Finally, de Groot (1969) identifies four phases of theoretical model building: Exploration, Analysis, Classification, and Explanation. The following sections expand on these phases and outline the research methods used in this study. Ethics approval for this study was granted by the Research Ethics Board at the University of Regina (see Appendix A).

3.3.1. Phase 1: Exploration

The purpose of the exploration phase, states de Groot (1969), “is to define the scope of the investigation” (p. 35). Exploration functions as a precursor to the formal research program. In this phase, the researcher takes a broad account of personal experience and a narrow account of particular issue(s) in the research literature. Taken together, these accounts provide the basis for establishing the research question and methodology.

Personal Experience

I come to the research with over 15 years of experience in youth development, sport and community programming, and governance. During this time, I have held various program and policy-related roles. I have also lived, worked, and volunteered in communities across Canada and abroad. These experiences ground my approach to the work. They also make a positive contribution to the inter-cultural, inter-sectoral, and inter-personal focus of this study. In addition, these experiences play a critical role in shaping data analysis, a point that is taken up in the following section.

In 2000, I spent eight months as a Co-program Coordinator for Right to Play–Benin. My role was to establish a child-centred development-through-sport program within the refugee camp of Kpomassé. This project included activities such as:

---

45 My partner and I were part of the first cohort of Right to Play volunteers.
community mapping, forming a community sports council, facility development, and
delivery of sport and cultural activities. This work was carried out in French.

This experience was an important catalyst for pursuing a Master’s degree and, in
due course, my current doctoral research. As I reflected on my work in Benin, I felt that
the most important development variable was the quality of the relationships that were
formed. My Master’s thesis used Aristotle’s philosophy of friendship as a framework for
understanding these relationship experiences (Cameron, 2005). This research prompted
further questioning of development relationships (Cameron, 2006), such as:

• Are there different kinds of development relationships?
• How do these relationships relate to expected results?
• How does the development stakeholder relationship impact the development
  process?
• What are we willing to change?

Data collection for this dissertation was primarily conducted during a one-year
Rotary Ambassadorial Scholarship. This scholarship promotes cross-cultural
understanding based on the Rotary principles of truth, fairness, goodwill, friendship, and
reciprocal benefit. Through this scholarship, I was able to enroll in the sport-for-
development department at the University of Trinidad and Tobago [UTT]. It was here
that I was first introduced to Mark Mungal (a program director in the department). As
part of my UTT experience, I participated in a project evaluation (Speyside, Tobago) and
the design of a monitoring and evaluation tool (Nurturing Child-Friendly Communities)
for TTASPE.
**Particular Issues**

As identified in Chapter Two, the main issue is that while development partnership promises much in terms of addressing historic development concerns, its record of delivery on these promises is questionable. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is a lack of theoretical scrutiny. If we accept that development partnership is a social theory and that social theory is an attempt to articulate our identity, then approaching development partnership through the philosophical lens of identity allows for a more complete understanding of the issue facing development partnership. This study also recognizes a secondary issue: TTASPE’s interest in learning more about its partnerships. Addressing this issue connects the theoretical study to the real concerns and experiences of development partners.

**Research Question**

Narrowing the gap between development partnership theory and practice requires more than an instrumental or normative account of partnerships. It requires a deeper exploration of the philosophical foundations of partnership (Barnes & Brown, 2011). Taylor’s discussions of social theory as practice (1983) and identity as moral ontology (1989) provide a framework for this type of deeper exploration. This study adopts Taylor’s approach. In doing so, the primary research question becomes *who are development partners?*

The following questions are included as corollaries to the primary research question:

a) What are the normative elements and instrumental functions of partnership?

b) How do these elements and functions manifest themselves in practice?
Methodology

Bava (2004) argues that development studies are the mother of all social sciences. This distinction permits a wide range of research methodologies to be used in researching development issues. This study draws on three contemporary complementary research methodologies (cultural studies, participatory research, and decolonizing methodologies). These methodologies are important for establishing research methods that: 1) permit an epistemology of understanding, 2) allow for blended-ontology research, and 3) are sensitive to the ethical issues that arise from development and cross-cultural research.

Cultural studies methodologies focus on identity and the use of dialect inquiry to address cultural differences (Radcliffe, 2006). Participatory methodology also acknowledges cultural differences (Chambers, 1984). However, its emphasis is on engaging local populations in the research process in order to capitalize on existing expertise and expand the range of developed capacities (Chambers, 2010). Decolonizing methodologies combines ideas of cultural differences and local capacity development, but with a slightly different focus. Instead of viewing identity as something that shapes the research process, decolonizing methodologies emphasize the way that identity can also be shaped by the research (Smith, 1999). While cultural studies and participatory research methodologies are common to development studies, the addition of decolonizing methodologies provides the strongest link to Taylor’s (1983) argument for the importance of acknowledging the link between what we do and who we are.

Culture consists of a complex set of social customs, values, expectations, and assumptions. It is also flexible in nature (Feibleman, 1951; Eagleton, 2000). Admittedly, in some cases, culture seems static. For example, friendliness is a consistent trait of
Canadian culture. In other cases, culture seems dynamic. For example, in Canada, the legal drinking age varies from province to province. Frow and Morris (2000) suggest that its flexible nature allows for cross-disciplinary research approaches, an eclectic range of research methods, and blended research ontology. At the same time, this level of research diversity means that cultural studies may be criticized for presenting an incoherent field of study (Jupp, 2006). Nevertheless, it is hard to deny the role that culture plays in shaping our relationship with the world around us.

Since the 1990s, cultural studies have played an increasingly important part in development research (Worsley, 1999). The cultural turn in development studies was driven by an increased focus on interpretive evaluative practices (Schech & Haggis, 2000) and a desire within the development community to move beyond economic development indicators (Berg, 2007). Most importantly, cultural studies provided a way to re-establish development relationships and guard against concerns about Western homogeneity and hegemony (Radcliffe, 2006).

For example, Clammer (2005) argues that culture provides “an arena of struggle”. It is a basic unit of analysis for exploring politically and ethically charged development goals and agendas. He claims: “the main failure of conventional development thinking has been to ignore the existential qualities of human life, what makes it actually worth living, which confers meaning on it for its participants” (p. 110). In Clammer’s view, development efforts fail not just because they are not sensitive to local conditions, but also because they do not pay attention to what was locally important: It is one thing to figure out whether a chicken can survive in a certain community; it is another to figure out whether the community wanted it in the first place.
Participatory research, or participatory action research (PAR), combines solid research with a strong social ethics. PAR stems from the participatory development approaches that emerged in the 1970s. Like participatory development, PAR seeks to address the pitfalls of top-down development efforts. It champions small-scale, locally driven initiatives. These types of initiative are able to transform development donor-recipient relations in ways that formal large-scale stand-alone research project are not (Eyben, Leon, & Hossain, 2007). Since PAR challenges the researcher to engage the research subject (e.g., local populations) in the research process, it provides greater depth of analytical richness.\(^{46}\)

PAR creates an opportunity for mutual learning (Chambers, 1994). It is thought to foster trust, increase support for research, address locally important issues, and assist the translating knowledge into action (Lilja & Bellon, 2008). In order for this process to unfold, the researcher must begin by acknowledging his bias. Once this acknowledgment happens, the research is then able to build on local skills, knowledge, and values to ensure locally driven analysis and conclusions (Chambers, 1984). At its best, PAR facilitates an open dialogue that promotes reflexivity on an issue. However, PAR is not always employed at its best.

Campbell (2001, 2002) identifies several concerns regarding PAR. Two of the most relevant concerns involve the quality of participation and the level of trust between researcher and participants. Participation levels in PAR range from passive (e.g., You can take part or not.) to manipulative (e.g., You believe your participation has impact, when it

\(^{46}\) Participatory action research (PAR) has strong development connections to participatory rural appraisal (PRA), arguably a specific application of the general principles as championed by Chambers (1984, 1994, 1994a)
Mikkelsen (2005) argues that the quality of participation depends, to a great extent, on the motivations of the various stakeholders (a concern that cultural studies helps to address). He also suggests that not all research projects require the same level of participation. Therefore, the researcher is challenged to work with the local population to establish the appropriate level of participation. This challenge is further complicated when we consider the importance of trust.

How do participants or researchers know that they are not being manipulated? Chances are they do not know or, as is more likely, do not know until it is too late. Nevertheless, studies by Dorsner (2007) and McGrath, Armstrong, and Marinova (2004) emphasize the importance of trust in establishing good PAR. These authors suggest that trust rarely exists at the start of PAR. It is something that has to built over the course of the research program, most often through keeping a series of reciprocal progressively demanding promises. Thus, it is recommended that PAR is most effective when basic levels of trust already exist or have existed over a longer period of time. Furthermore, Lilga and Bellon (2008) note that trust is particularly important in settings, such as those typically experienced in development, where socio-economic conditions vary greatly.

Trust is also a central factor in decolonizing methodologies. This research approach acknowledges that for some groups the mere mention of “research” brings up negative feelings. As Smith (1999) notes, historic attempts at colonization have left local groups (especially groups identified as indigenous, or “undeveloped”) leery, if not resentful, of foreign research interests. Therefore, the research emphasis is on allowing
local cultures to reclaim control over their own ways of knowing and being, and in the process, come to trust again.\footnote{Decolonizing methodologies share an affinity with post-development and are rooted in the post-modern and revolutionary scholarship of Michael Foucault, Paulo Friere, and Franz Fanon.}

Decolonizing methodologies view colonization and, by extension, development as a thinly veiled process of dehumanization. Thus, the researcher must be aware not just of the methods that are employed (as emphasized by PAR), but the language and style used in the research questions as well (Bartlett, Iwaki, Gottleib, Hall & Mannell, 2008). Research that adopts locally relevant language is not only more relevant to the participants (as argued by cultural studies), but it allows the research to become a natural extension of participants.

At the same time decolonizing methodologies link philosophic issues of epistemology and ontology. These methodologies challenge the extent to which the researcher can ever know the Other. Rooted in an epistemology of understanding, it emphasizes that sound social science research must consists of more than accurate descriptions. It must be an attempt at self-identification. Therefore, a valid understanding of what is happening can only be established by acknowledging who one is. This focus on identity fits well within framework of this study and the primary research question. Just as important, while decolonizing methodologies challenges the researcher to reconsider a new understanding of the relationship between identity and research, it does not necessarily demand the reconsideration of research methods. As Smith (1999) argues:

Decolonizing… does not mean and has not meant a total rejection of all theory or research or Western knowledge. Rather, it is about centering our
concerns and world views and then coming to know and understand theory
and research from [local] perspectives and for [local] purposes. (p. 39)

Together, cultural studies, PAR, and decolonizing methodologies provide a solid
foundation for creating a theoretical model of development partnership. Importantly,
these methodologies do not tell the researcher what to do. Rather, they establish
parameters for what good research is. Good research is something that is aware of
cultural difference, builds on local expertise, and acknowledges the relationship between
who we are and what we try to do.

3.3.2. Phase II: Analysis

Analysis has two main objectives: 1) to ensure a variety of sound data points, and
2) to establish data collection methods that allow for comparisons between the data points
that are in line with the philosophical foundations and overall objective of the study (de
Groot, 1969). This section details how these objectives are met. It begins with a
discussion of case study research, identifies the primary and secondary data sources, and
concludes by outlining the analytic methods that will guide the classification phase.

Case Study Research

This study adopts a case study approach. A case study is the detailed observation
of a group, person, or event. Ragin (1992) argues that virtually every social scientific
study can be conceived as a case study. “At a minimum,” he writes, “every study is a
case study because it is an analysis of social phenomena specific to time and place” (p.
2). Regardless of the phenomenon in question, case studies provide intrinsic and
instrumental information (Stake, 2000). They give insight into a specific instance
(intrinsic) and can be compared with other experiences (instrumental).
Abbot (1992) identifies two epistemological approaches to case study: analytic and narrative. Analytic studies tend to focus on populations (e.g., ethical considerations of North American physicians) and are more ontologically rigid, follow strict linear progressions, and identify the expected relationship between structures and agents. Narrative studies range from a single case to several cases and are more ontologically fuzzy. They allow for broader temporal exploration, focus on events of significance, and “need make no assumption that all causes lie on the same analytic [ontological] level” (p. 68). This study adopts a narrative approach.

However, the flexible nature of a case study leaves it open to a variety of criticisms. Yin (1994) identifies three main limitations of narrative case study: 1) they do not provide a high level of investigative rigor; 2) they provide little basis for generalization; and 3) they can take too long and result in massive, unreadable documents. He goes on to argue that while such criticisms reflect some historical case study research, current case study research can be structured to address these concerns.

This study approaches Yin’s (1994) concerns in the following ways. Issues with case study (or what will be later discussed as authenticity) are addressed through the researcher’s ability to: accurately account for his personal, cultural, and academic biases (Schratz & Walker, 1994); include multiple data sources (Stake, 1995); and acknowledge and include research participants as part of the process (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). The issue of generalization has more to do with epistemology than reliability. Narrative case studies have a fundamental duality (Watson, 1992). They are able to provide a description of a particular phenomenon and offer theoretical insight into the general experience. As Yin (1994) explains, “case studies, like experiments are generalizable to
theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (p. 10). In other words, the case study provides an opportunity to create or expand theories (analytic generalization) related to the case. Theoretical accuracy beyond the case in question is not guaranteed. Therefore, while good theory can be based on a single case, that theory must be further studied to determine its applicability to other cases. Finally, the issue of managing the breadth of case study data is linked to the particular analytic methods used in the study. The conclusion of a case study cannot be a simple restatement of the collected information. It must, writes Hamel, Dufor, and Fortin (1993), “provide information, that while based on the analysis of the field information, transcends this information” (p. 48), making the handling and discussion of the case more concise.

Primary Data Sources

The primary data for this study is drawn from TTASPE and its partners. TTASPE has established itself as an important development-through-sport hub in Trinidad and Tobago and throughout the Caribbean region. Over the past ten years, TTASPE has established a number of partnerships with international organizations and foreign government agencies, as well as local government ministries, organizations, and communities. The choice to use TTASPE as the hub development organization was influenced by personal connections in Trinidad and Tobago, logistical concerns, and TTASPE’s willingness to work with a foreign researcher. The partners included this study were identified by TTASPE.

It is worth noting that independently of this study, and prior to my initial contact, TTASPE (2010) had identified a need to better understand its partnerships. Examining

---

A fuller description of the case is found in Chapter Four.
its current partnerships would allow TTASPE to create clearer long-term partnership arrangements and expectations, thus enhancing its ability to meet its organizational objective. TTASPE’s support for this study was critical for gaining access to and interest from its partners.

Allowing TTASPE to identify its partners could skew the case towards a narrow set of pro-TTASPE partners. However, TTASPE included both close working partners (e.g., local program deliverers) and peripheral yet structurally important partners (e.g., Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education). The final data set was arrived at based on discussion between TTASPE and myself regarding who was a key partner and which of these partners was willing or able to participate in the interview process within the study period.

*Primary Data Source Collection Method: Interview Technique*

Primary data sources were engaged through a series of semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews provide exploratory and descriptive data. They allow for “thick” description of the case and leave the conversation free to move in new directions or adopt more locally appropriate language (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006), a key requirement of the research methodologies. The semi-structured interview method also permitted the interview questions to be refined as the research progressed. Furthermore, the questions were meant to guide, not dictate, the data collection process. When possible, the interviews were conducted face-to-face, recorded for audio, and supplemented by field notes. This approach increases my familiarity with both context and non-verbal participant voices (i.e., physical environment and personal mannerisms) (Creswell, 2007). Interviews lasted between 30 and 90 minutes.
It is worth commenting on the limitations of interviews that were conducted via phone and e-mail. Both of these methods negate the ability to record or assess the non-verbal participant voice. Just as important, if the interviewer is not known the interviewee it is less likely that the interviewee will provide reliable information (Thomas & Shane, 2011). With this study, I had made face-to-face contact, at least once and in several cases more than that, with all but three of the phone and e-mail interviewees prior to the interview. Further to establishing my credentials, TTASPE had contacted each person regarding this project prior to engaging in the interview process. I was also able to meet with one of the interviewees after the interview.

At no time did any of the phone interviewees indicate any hesitation to answer questions, nor did their voice or tone indicate discomfort or disengagement with the process. The most challenging and limited interview was the one conducted via e-mail. This particular respondent made it quite clear early on that he felt he had nothing to add to the study and was not interested in further communication. Given that this individual represented a potentially more negative understanding of partnership with TTASPE it unfortunate that phone or face-to-face communication was not possible. More to the point, with only words on a page, it is difficult to infer the tone or broader context in which they were written. The data set, particularly given its brevity, added little insight to the research,

Pre-testing of the interview process and questions was conducted with development stakeholders in similar organizational or geographical realities to those of the primary data sources. The main purpose of pre-testing was to increase confidence that the questions used context specific language and to establish common language
patterns between various settings. Context specific language, notes Taylor (1959), is language that only has relevance to certain contexts (e.g., “sin” has no intrinsic meaning to those who do not follow Christian theology). With common language, disparate groups accept a term as meaningful, but question its particular interpretation (e.g., all Olympic athletes speak of “fair play,” but engage in it differently).

This study identifies the potential for both types of linguistic concern. While these concerns hold generally true for intercultural studies, they are of particular interest regarding the core concepts of development, sport-for-development, partnership, and identity. Not all of the primary data sources use these terms or use them regularly. Some of the sources have established working definitions (e.g., UNICEF and “partnership”), others use terms without a working definition (e.g., TTASPE and “partnership”), and still others do not use the terms but adhere to activities with similar descriptions (e.g., Schools and sport-for-development”). However, while these words may not be obviously meaningful, they are acknowledged in practice. As Fasiku (2007) notes, there is a long history of philosophers who have argued that Africa had no philosophic tradition. In fact, this “lack of philosophy” was the result of meaningless translation (Masolo, 1994; Wiredu, 2004). This issue was particularly important in translating Taylor’s (1989) philosophical definition of identity: moral ontology.

The interviews provided access to stakeholders’ thoughts, beliefs, values, and actions regarding development partnerships. Fontana and Frey (2000) note that valid data depends upon: the authentic assessment of the interview setting, understanding of the cultural context, and gaining the trust of the interviewee and establishing a rapport. At the same time, the researcher must guarantee the interviewee’s informed consent, right
to privacy, and protection from harm. To this end, I spent time working and talking with key TTASPE members and some of its local partners. These interactions built a positive rapport. Both TTASPE and I acknowledge the link between forming strong partnerships and achieving effective development practices. TTASPE and I expressed a mutual interest in gaining a better understanding of TTASPE’s development partnerships.

In order to make the interview process as transparent as possible, all interviewees were provided with a synopsis of the research and its objectives. Also, interviewees were asked to sign waivers or provide verbal consent, indicating that they understood the study and were willing to participate. Reasonable efforts were made to ensure interviewee voices were captured while protecting their individual identity and organizational profile (see Creswell, 2007). Given the nature of this case, it was impossible to ensure complete interviewee anonymity. Nevertheless, interviewee names have not been used, references to particular individuals have been omitted, and all comments are linked to the partner organizations. Some responses were given from a personal, rather than professional, perspective. Such responses are attributed to a generic “partner” pseudonym. Lastly, I conducted all of the interviews. While this contributed to data consistency, it also raised the possibility of power imbalances between the interviewee and myself. However, power dynamics cannot be avoided; therefore, they must be recognized and when possible mitigated. To this end, I relied on both my connection with TTASPE, and independent research status, to encourage open interview responses. Finally, interviews were scheduled based on the: a) time and location set by interviewee, b) time and location agreed upon by interviewee and myself, or c) time and location that I suggested.

49 In this context, verbal consent was particularly important for two reasons: 1) Trinidad and Tobago has a high level of adult and youth illiteracy (CCYD, 2010), and 2) phone interviews made signatures problematic.
Appendix B provides the question template that was used to guide the interviews. The questions are organized around the main research questions, with the addition of some organizational and personal background questions.

Finally, there is some concern as to whether interviews are appropriate for a study based on an ontological blend of holisms and individualisms: how well can a method that taps into individual meaning provide insight into system influence? This potential shortcoming is addressed in two ways. First, blended ontology looks for the play between “Games” and “Actors”; the semi-structured interview process is left open for participants to discuss systemic factors that impact on their partnership. Actors are able to give voice to ways in which systems are a part of their individual experience. Second, the interviews were supplemented with secondary data sources (e.g., organizational reports, observation) that provided further insight into the role of structures in the relationship between development partnership ontology and ethics.

Secondary Data Sources

Secondary data sources were drawn from identified stakeholders, literature on development relationships and partnerships, and philosophic writing on identity, human ontology, and ethics, with emphasis on key development related philosophers. Stakeholder sources included policy statements, working documents, mission statements, and reports pertaining to development relationships, ethics, and procedures. When possible, attempts were made to observe partners in action.

---

50 Interview data from the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee (TTOC) was also considered. While TTOC conducts sport-for-development programs in Trinidad and Tobago, it does not work with TTASPE and was not identified as a partner. However, TTASPE and TTOC do partner with some of the same organizations.
Development literature was drawn from journals and books referenced in Chapter Two. Key search terms included, but were not limited to: development partnerships, “donor – recipient” relationships, post-colonial development relationship, colonial relationships, dependency, capacity building, development autonomy, participatory development, post-modern or post-development relationship, organizational identity, and identity.

Philosophic references were sought from a range of Western and non-Western sources. Western sources included: Aristotle, John Stuart Mill, Rawls, Foucault, Sartre, Heidegger, and Nietzsche. These sources were selected based on their popularity in development literature and focus on ontology and ethics. Given the cultural make up of Trinidad and Tobago, non-Western philosophic considerations included: African and Afro-Caribbean philosophy, Hinduism and Islamic thought.

Researcher Bias

As discussed, research authenticity partially depends on acknowledging and accounting for the researcher’s experience in the research process. This study approaches my personal experience in three ways. First, my experiences as an athlete, youth activity programmer, and sport-for-development practitioner provide a solid theoretical and practical understanding of sport delivery, programming, and development potential. These experiences also gave me some credibility with the participants.

Second, as an outsider and an academic, I had to be aware of potential power differentials with the participants. Any sense of familiarity with participants was tempered with an awareness of cultural, educational, occupational, age, and gender differences. For this reason, most interviews were conducted after two or more
encounters with the participant. Participants were provided with preliminary data analysis and classifications and were asked for feedback.

Third, my professional relationship with TTASPE provided me with an opportunity to establish a trusting relationship with the participants. This close connection could have had a negative impact on the data collection process, such that, participants may have withheld or obscured information. However, there was no evidence that participants were reluctant to share information. There was also a concern that strong empathy for the participants may have artificially narrowed the possibilities for data interpretation. This concern was addressed by my conducting the primary data analysis in Canada several months after the data was collected. This was done without direct input from TTASPE or its partners.

Data Analysis

Mikkelsen (2005) suggests that credible qualitative analysis is based on four guiding principles: 1) ensuring that analysis is focused on the purpose of the study, 2) clarifying the analysis strategy, 4) establishing patterns and categories through induction, and 4) acknowledging the process of identifying linkages, causes, consequences, and relationships among the data. These principles were incorporated as follows.

Primary data sources (semi-structured interviews) were transcribed and managed using N-Vivo7 qualitative analysis software. This software aided in the progressive coding and interpretive process. When necessary (and logistically possible), the interviewees were contacted to clarify their original interview statements. Interviewee names and organizational affiliations were recorded, but excluded from the working data set. Interviews in the set were referred to by a non-descriptive code.
Once the information was collected and transcribed, I read through a hard copy of the interviews then created nodes for the software-assisted analysis. These efforts helped to identify and enhance the chances of an unbiased (or at least transparent) data interpretation. The next step was to code the interview data using progressive focused coding tactics (Mikkelsen, 2005). The aim here was to refine codes until an overriding significance of events emerged from the data (Charmaz, 2000). Finally, secondary data sources were included in the analysis process to provide a broader context for the emerging constructs.

The analysis was guided by a blend of conversation analysis and ethnography (Maynard, 2006; Tedlock, 2000). Through this approach, I considered both what was said and the broader context in which statements were made. The approach also allowed me to draw tentative conclusions regarding a) why recognizable constellations of social order take on locally distinctive shapes, and b) why practice proceeds in the direction that it does (i.e., toward what end, in pursuit of what goals, and in relation to what meanings) (Gubrium, & Holstein, 2000).

3.3.3. **Phase III: Classification**

In this phase, the interpreted data was organized into constructs that reflect the intent of the research questions. As de Groot (1969) states, these constructs are “largely determined by the investigative procedures and their results…. Sometimes [in the

---

51 Maynard (2004) suggests that conversation analysis involves the scrutiny of recordings and transcripts. As he explains, “utterances, by virtue of the sequence in which why appear, perform recognizable social actions” (p. 55).

Tedlock (2000) defines ethnography as a grounded theory method that involves “placing specific encounters, events, and understandings, into a fuller more meaningful context…to produce historically, politically, and personally situated accounts, descriptions, interpretations, and representations of human lives” (p. 455).
process] their boundaries become more sharply defined; sometimes they shift; sometimes a concept is discarded or split up; sometimes new constructs are generated” (p. 116). Classification, therefore, is an inferential endeavor; what matters most is the process by which these concepts emerge. Its authenticity hinges on the manner in which the research was conducted.

From an epistemology of understanding, authenticity is determined based on how well the classifications “crystallize” the participants’ experiences. Whereas triangulation uses different methods to find convergence in the research findings (Denzin, 1978), crystallization uses different methods to ensure the authenticity of what is found (Richardson, 2000). Crystallization forces the researcher to suspend reliance on pre-determined constructs and accept the constructs that emerged from the research process. This approach provides the researcher with the ability to refrain from “methodaltry” and formulate meaningful questions and classifications (Janesick, 2000).

In this phase, the researcher compared the themes developed from the primary data sources to those emerging from the secondary data sources. Attention was given to similarities and differences that arose between the emergent themes and the key phrases, thoughts, or words identified by each theme. Mindful of the study’s main research questions, the themes were organized with respect to the ideas of development partnership and identity formation.

During this phase, it was important to maintain a stakeholder voice and hand in the research process (Smith, 1999). Therefore, focused data was shared with key informants from each geographical stakeholder group. As part of this process, TTASPE

---

52 “Methodaltry”, notes Janesick (2000), combines method and idolatry to mean a preoccupation with selecting and defending methods to the exclusion of the actual substance of the story being told.
and its participating partners were provided with the classified data and partnership model. The participants were then given a two-month period to provide feedback. During this period, participants were contacted once to remind them that their feedback was important. An outline of the model was also presented at the NextSteps Conference: 2001, held in Trinidad and Tobago. Feedback from both sources was included in the final model.

3.3.4. Phase IV: Explanation

In the explanation phase, the researcher is tasked with communicating the study findings with others. This study communicates its findings in two formats. First, it provides a theoretical model of development partnership and identity. Models, notes Kaplan (1964), are “only those theories which explicitly direct attention to certain resemblances between the theoretical entities and the real subject-matter” (p. 265). The model presented here is an interpretive-theoretical model (de Groot, 1969). It applies Taylor’s (1989) philosophical understanding of identity (moral ontology) to the “real” partnership experiences of TTASPE, thus providing a practical extension of Taylor’s work and theoretical understanding of TTASPE’s development partnerships.

Second, the study offers TTASPE and its partners a narrative of their partnership experiences. Over the course of the research, it was apparent that each organization knew very little about its partner’s broader operational context. A case summary provides the participants and other development partners with insight into actual partnership experiences and articulates how the model can help to improve the understanding and effectiveness of development partnership experiences. Through these explanations, it is
hoped that the study can make a substantive contribution to development field, and generate new questions, thoughts, or actions (Richardson, 2000).

Limitations

Trying to represent local knowledge, states Fournillier (2009), “is a complex, complicated, and muddy task” (p. 760). There is always a danger that I will be unable to a) put aside my agenda and listen to those who know, b) accept the unexpected, and c) balance my multiple roles as worker, expert, foreigner, and student. Just as important, argues de Groot (1969), “one can never completely rule out other interpretations once a particular interpretation has been worked out” (p. 311). The best way to address these limitations is by establishing methods and methodologies that clarify the process used for collecting and interpreting the data. The previous sections outline the research process and demonstrate the logical consistency underlying: questions, philosophy, data collection, classification, and explanation.

Another limitation of this research approach is the participants’ willingness or ability to fully participate in the process. As Smith (1999) states:

Idealistic ideas about community collaboration and active participation need to be tempered with realistic assessments of a community’s resources and capabilities, even if there is enthusiasm and goodwill. Similarly, the involvement of community resources and people also needs to be considered before putting additional responsibility on individuals already carrying heavy burdens of duty. (p. 79)

To this end, a great deal of effort was put into establishing a positive relationship with TTASPE and its partners before the data collection began. Even with this effort, the level
of participant engagement during the data collection was not consistent with the level of engagement during the other research phases. Nevertheless, participants were active in shaping the final conclusions.

3.4. Summary

Good research is grounded in establishing a logical connection between the research question and the study methods. To establish this connection, the researcher must make several philosophical and methodological choices. This chapter began by highlighting the philosophical choices a researcher must make (Hollis, 1993). It then identified the philosophical research paradigm used in this study (understanding and blended ontology). Based on these choices, the chapter included a discussion of research methodologies (cultural, participatory, and decolonizing) and the corresponding methods that were used in this study. Also, the chapter explained the type of conclusions that were expected from the study and addressed the major study limitations. In short, this chapter outlines the process and challenges for addressing the lack of theoretical scrutiny of development partnerships by creating a theoretical model of partnership and identity.
4. SPORT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF TTASPE

Sport is a value-loaded and context-specific term. For many in the West the link between sport and development is, at best, tenuous. Noam Chomski (1992), for example, has famously referred to sport as “training in irrational jingoism”. He suggests that sport does little more than distract people from matters that are truly important to existence. This view of sport is not unfounded (e.g., Fowler, 2007). However, it tells only part of the story.

Sport is also understood as: a ritual sacrifice of human energy (Sansone, 1998), a common cultural/political currency between people (Houlihan, 1997), an arena shaped by struggles both on and off the field (Elias & Dunning, 1986), a place of enjoyment and escape (Seippel, 2006), a prison (Brohm; 1978), a mechanism for the affirmation of identity and difference (Foer, 2004), a business (Hill, 2008), a social product (Gruneau, 1999), a euphemism of Western/capital ideals (Gur-Ze’ev, 2005), and a political tool (Ndee, 2005). Further complicating the matter, sport is commonly used alongside or interchangeably with terms such as play, recreation, or physical activity. However, in an academic context, these words mean something quite different. Coakley and Donnelly (2004) distinguish practical and motivational differences between sport, play, and dramatic spectacle[^53]. Gruneau (1999), focusing on social function, argues that play, games, and sport can be escapist, constructive, or transformative. Other authors

[^53]: Sport-institutionalizes competitive activities involve rigorous physical exertion or the use of relatively complex physical skills by participants who are motivated by personal enjoyment and external rewards. Play–is an expressive activity done for its own sake: it may be spontaneous or guided by informal norms. Dramatic Spectacle–involves physical performances that entertain an audience (Coakley & Donnelly, 2004).
distinguish between sport and leisure (e.g. Rojek, 2005), sport and recreation (e.g. Elias & Dunning, 1986), or sport and physical education (e.g. Green, Smith, & Roberts, 2005).

With all of this variation, it is no wonder that the link between sport and development is obfuscated. To simplify matters, this study adopts the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group [SDP IWG] definition of sport. SDP IWG defines sport as “all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction such as, play, recreation, organized or competitive sport, and indigenous sports, and indigenous sports and games” (Right to Play, 2008, p.1). Under this direction, the chapter discusses the potential, history, and challenges of development-through-sport. It also situates TTASPE within the broader social, political, and economic environment of Trinidad and Tobago, and explains the decision to choose TTASPE for this study.

4.1. Sport and Development

4.1.1. The Potential of Sport

Jarvie (2004) argues that sport provides more than a “simple distraction from reality.” It provides an avenue for “analyzing, demystifying and ultimately attempting to contribute to social change, explanation and intervention in the world in which we live” (p. 580). By engaging in sport, we automatically enter into dialogue with each other and with our environment (Eichberg, 1995). Therefore, in so much as we are able to “use the dynamics of communication, be reflective or self-reflective, to develop extraordinary capacities” (Krattli, 1995, p.54), sport functions as a critical social force and a vehicle for development.
There are several ways in which sport makes important social contributions. For example, Youcef (1994) and Hargreaves (2000) highlight the role sport plays in the strengthening of national identity and nationalism in developing and developed countries.\footnote{Houlihan (1997) warns, however, that while sport symbolism can be utilized to great effect, its malleability often undermines its ability to have a long lasting effect.} Willis (2000) writes of the ability of grassroots sports organizations in Kenya to challenge gender stereotypes and environmental standards. In Canada, sport was identified as the second most influential factor in developing positive values in youth (Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, 2002).\footnote{Family was number one.}

Sport also provides a unique opportunity and mechanism for communication. Sport has ready-made structures that highlight issues of progress and performance, cooperation, collaboration, and competition. Void of real political power, it allows participants to play out different scenarios and explore relationships from various standpoints. For example, Keim’s (2003) study of post-apartheid South Africa showed how sporting relations based on skill allowed athletes to increase significantly the number of friendships amongst participants from different backgrounds. Similarly, Lyras (2004) demonstrated how sport selection based on interest fostered friendships between Greek and Turkish Cypriot youth. Both examples demonstrate the ways in which sport allows us to reframe our identity and re-establish relationships and ideals in non-traditional ways. As a critical social force, sport has the ability to foster intercultural dialogue and action. Predicated on relationships of cooperation and competition (Kretchmar, 1998), it holds the potential for establishing and exploring the relationship between the Self and
the Other. It is also argued that sport can be a source of economic growth and revenue generation.

As will be discussed shortly, it is important to remember that while sport has a lot of positive potential, such outcomes are not guaranteed (Schwery, 2003). For example, European interest in African athletes (male soccer players in particular) has been linked to the increased child trafficking to Europe (Donnelly, 1997). Similarly, basing sport-for-development programs on Western sports has also been questioned for contributing to the loss of indigenous sport and play (Darnell, 2007).

4.1.2. A Brief History of Sport and Development

In the early days of the post-World War II development era, major development organizations, such as the UN, were sympathetic to the connection between sport and development, but not directly supportive. For example, UNESCO’s support of the International Council of Sport and Physical Education [ICSPE] led to the addition of play to the 1991 revision of the Declaration on the Rights of the Child. Similarly, the International Olympic Committee [IOC] established the International Aid Olympic Committee. These initiatives were primarily driven by the Olympic sport ideals (stronger, higher, faster) and focused exclusively on increasing Third World representation at the 1972 Olympic summer games. In effect, development assistance was mainly financial, providing funds to national government ministries to built elite training facilities (Houlihan & White, 2002; Anthony, 1983).

However, in 1969, the UN made a significant financial contribution to sport development initiatives. Importantly, this funding was directed not just towards infrastructure improvements, but also to research the broader connection between sport
and development. Money was forthcoming to explore whether sport could modernize attitudes towards hunger, high birth rates, unemployment, and socially maladaptive behaviour. Anthony (1969) suggested that sport (being grounded in national identity, international laws, and cultural rituals) would be an acceptable medium for health education and literacy programs. A leading scholar at the time, Anthony argued that we needed to better understand if and how sport could “provide a chance for youth to learn group organization and administration techniques, for communities to enrich their imaginative power, for shifting community trends), while being easily integrated into schools (thus affecting dropout rates) and accelerating the emancipation of women” (p.11).

As sport-for-development gained prominence there was growing confusion between competition-focused sport development and socially-focused sport development (Siegler, 1981). No clear distinction between these two was made until the early 1990s (Bykhovakaya, 1991). Houlihan and White (2000) explain the difference as follows:

**Development through Sport** is externally focused development, emphasizing sport as a tool to meet social objectives and encourage human growth.  

**Sport development** is internally oriented development, in which sport is valued and enhanced for its own sake.

Prior to this formal distinction, sport did not receive much attention as a viable development tool. For example, in 1986, the Government of Canada (now a leader in sport-for-development) had yet to be involved in any educational project using sport or

---

56 The term “development through sport” is synonymous with the now often used term “sport for development”.

57 One notable exception is the Mathare Youth Sports Association, Kenya, founded in 1987 by a Canadian, Bob Munro.
physical education. Similarly, sporting efforts by Canadian NGOs such as the World University Service of Canada [WUSC] and Canadian sport organizations such as the Canadian Commonwealth Games Association [CGC], or the Coaching Association of Canada [CAC], and major sports organizations such as the IOC, focused solely on sport development projects (Ross, 1986).

In 1994, this situation began to change. Following the Lillehammer Olympics, a group of Olympic Athletes headed by Johan Olav Koss and supported by prominent sport and development organizations began Right To Play (RTP). RTP initially leveraged athletes’ Olympic winnings and fame to provide funds for existing development aid programs. RTP soon grew to create its own sport centred programming, which focused on development-through-sport, targeting children in refugee camps. Today, RTP provides a variety of programs and support in 23 developing countries, and has become one of the most prominent development-through-sport NGOs in the world and a strong advocate for development through sport (Right to Play, 2010). Around the same time, Commonwealth Games Canada, funded by the Canadian International Development Agency, started its own series of sport-based development initiatives, focusing its efforts in Zimbabwe and the Caribbean region (CGC, 2010).

In 2002, the UN established a Special Advisor and Inter-agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace. This step led to a series of international conferences

---

58 Koss was at the top of his athletic career, having just won three gold medals, each with a new world record, for speed skating at the 1994 Lillehammer Olympics.

59 Lillehammer Winter Olympic Organizing Committee, the Red Cross, Save the Children, The Norwegian Refugee Council, the Norwegian Church Council, and the Norwegian People’s Council.
that focused on establishing a list of key objectives for development-through-sport.\(^{60}\) It also led to the creation of the SDP IWG.\(^{61}\) This group was commissioned to provide strategies for increasing support and awareness of the link between sports and development goals (UN, 2003). More specifically, it worked to a) outline directions for establishing practical measures for increased awareness and support of sport-for-development (Right to Play, 2006), and b) provide government policy-makers with a solid foundation on which to build their own policies, programs, and initiatives (Right to Play, 2008).\(^{62}\)

### 4.1.3. Impacts and Challenges

Currently, development-through-sport ideals have been adopted by a number of international organizations (e.g., Fédération Internationale de Football Association [FIFA], the IOC, and Commonwealth Games Association), governments (e.g., Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Australian Ministry of General Sport Affairs, PR and International Relations; and Canadian Heritage Ministry), and local NGOs (e.g., Physical Activity Youth in Namibia, the Mathare Youth Soccer Association in Kenya, and the Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education). In turn, programs offered or supported by these groups have been able to highlight sport’s positive impact in areas such as: positive development (e.g., Fraser-Thomas, Cote, & Deakin, 2005), academic success (e.g., McMillan & Reed, 1994), citizenship (Eley & Kirk, 2002), cultivating peaceful relations (Lyras, 2007), and empowering girls and

---

\(^{60}\) The objectives include a call to participate and invest in the consolidation and expansion of global partnerships for sport and development (Magglingen, 2005).

\(^{61}\) The SDP IWG is comprised of elected government representatives, UN agencies, and civil society organizations (see Appendix C)

\(^{62}\) The UN declared 2005 the “Year of Sport and Physical Education.”
women (e.g., Brady & Banu-Khan, 2002). Through these efforts, development-through-sport has aligned successfully with the UN’s Millennium Development Goals (Right to Play, 2008) (see Appendix C).

In a relatively short period of time, sport has raised its development profile. However, sport still struggles for widespread acceptance as a viable development tool (Beutler, 2008). Anthony’s (1969) concerns that many countries reject sport concepts because they view them as lengthy and simplistic or that international development was more interested in “quick results” are just as valid today as they were when he first voiced them. Coatler (2010b) argues that current sport-for–development efforts contain a number of dangers. These include confusing micro-level outcomes with macro-level impacts, mission drift based to secure aid dollars, and overly ambitious non-sporting agendas. He goes on to suggest (Coatler, 2010a), that dangers are further exacerbated by unclear, ambiguous, and unstable policies.

Therefore, it remains important for development-through-sport to bridge the growing gap between its development potential and its reality (Kidd, 2008; Pound, 1992b).63 This study bridges the gap in three ways. First, the study marks an attempt to demonstrate how sport-for-development can useful in both supporting and expanding development theories and practices. As Darnell and Black (2011) point out, “an enduring challenge to the study of [sport-for-development], but also an opportunity for a

---

63 For pragmatic reasons (such as Pound’s desire for access to funding), non-governmental organizations, governments, and academics have focused mainly on the issues of monitoring and evaluation (e.g. Burnett, 2001, 2006; Burnett & Uys, 2000; Coatler, 2007; Mafukidze, 2008; Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, 2006). In spite of these efforts, the inability to translate participant experiences into a measurable outcome expectation is a major impediment for development in general, and sport-for-development in particular.
significant step forward for the field, it to situate the topic of sport more explicitly within the field of development studies” (p. 372). Second, this study engages sport-for-development practitioners in a process of self-discovery. Donelly, Atkinson, Boyle, and Szto (2011), argue that sport-for-development would benefit from a ‘public’ research approach. The approach positions sport-for-development research to illustrate its contribution to the development field and provide a constrictive analysis of the limitation of their actions. Third, this study highlights the need for sport-for-development practitioners to engage with a broader range of theoretical issues in order to establish greater conceptual clarity. Conceptual clarity is “one of the most important initial challenges to understanding [the sport-for-development] field” (Hartmann & Kwauk, 2011). By increasing their understanding of theoretical issues, practitioners are better able to align their practice with its intended outcome.

4.2. Sport-for-Development and Partnership

In their 2010 study, Hayhurst and Frisby identify over 400 sport-for-development non-government organizations, operating in over 125 counties. With the majority of these organizations having formed in recent years, partnership is seen as an essential to both organizational success and the advancement of development objectives. However, note Lindsey and Banda (2011), “few authors have specifically focused on the, or explicitly addressed, the ‘profoundly ambiguous’ terminology and highly complex dynamics associated with partnership in sport-for-development (p. 92).

A recent search of various sport and development journals identified three articles (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010, Kay, 2012, Lindsey & Banda, 2011,) and one report (Banda, 2011). Drawing on the idea of public sociology, public research is a nod to ‘applied research’.
Lindsey, Jeanes, and Kay, 2008) with a direct focus on exploring the partnership or relationship aspect of sport-for-development. While each study lends much to the field they are limited in the following ways. Hayhurst and Frisby’s study focuses on two Northern agencies (in an high performance-sport-for-development setting) and does not reflect the dominant reality of north-south partnerships. Kay’s work on the effects of monitoring and evaluation on north-south relations, though it brings in examples from practice, is largely theoretical. Lindsey and Banda offer the most robust look at development partnership. However, their work focuses on an issue (HIV/AIDS in Zambia) rather than an organization. As a result the work provides a strong overview partnerships in the sector, but offers limited insight into how these partnerships are formed or maintained.

Most relevant to this study, these works do not make a direct connection between partnership and identity. Discussion of sport-for-development and identity does factor into other works (Burnett, 2011, Darnell, 2001, Schulnerkorf, 2010a). However, these studies tend to focus on identity construction through sport experiences, or as part of critical analysis of research methods (Levermore & Beacom, 2012) or post-colonial programming (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2012). This study differs in that it does not seek apply a particular social lens to the issue of sport-for-development partnership. Instead, it opts for a broader philosophical exploration of partnership’s moral ontology.

---

65 The report by Banda, Lindsey, Jeanes, and Kay (2008) is directly related to Lindsey and Banda (2011). While the report has a slightly different focus, its results are treated as complimentary, rather than distinct from the Lindsey and Banda.
4.3. Trinidad and Tobago

The Caribbean region is geographically and culturally diverse. There are 14 countries in the region, stretching from Puerto Rico in the north to Guyana in the south. This chain of countries runs parallel to Central and South America, providing a terrestrial border between the Caribbean Sea (to the west) and the Atlantic Ocean (to the east). Rogozinski (1994) suggests that the Caribbean region underwent two phases of colonization. The start of the first wave is difficult to establish (approx. 7000 years ago). It is believed that this wave brought three cultural groups from South America (Columbia in particular) to the region: the Ciboney (or Siboney), the Arawak, and the Caribs. The second wave of colonization is linked to the arrival of Europe interests, with the voyages of Christopher Columbus beginning in 1492.

Besides the obvious geographical differences, Higman (2011) argues that the two waves had significantly different impacts on the regions. He describes the first wave as augmenting the natural resources of the region: the inhabitants sustained themselves through indigenous plant and animals. The second wave is described as destructive: Europeans replaced indigenous plants and animals with more familiar resources, depleted the renewable and non-renewable resources, and exterminated most of the indigenous peoples, only to replace them through the slave trade.

Post-Columbus, the Caribbean became an important income source for Britain, France, Spain, and, to a lesser extent, The Netherlands. Economic growth in the region was based on a growing plantation industry (e.g., sugar, banana, cocoa). This industry was run by European interests but driven by African slave labour (Beckford, 2001). Slave rebellions are recorded as far back as 1522 (in Puerto Rico), but the major shift in
Caribbean society came in 1838, when Great Britain abolished slavery in the region (Rogozinski, 1994). With the end of slavery, plantations turned to an indentured labour force (1845-1917), which was primarily drawn from India (Beckford, 2001). Colonial independence came at various times throughout the region. Haiti was the first country in the region to gain independence (in 1809 through force), with the majority of the countries becoming constitutionally independent in the mid 1960s and early 1970s (Higam, 2011).

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) (2008) described this region as highly indebted and at a rising risk of macroeconomic instability. This situation is largely due to undiversified economic sectors and no economies of scale (most countries rely on and compete for tourism and agricultural exports such as bananas and sugar). The most recent United Nations Development Program [UNDP] report (UNDP, 2000) on the region identifies the region as having high crime rates, being prone to natural disasters, and vulnerable to a number of serious health threats such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, diabetes, and malaria.

Trinidad and Tobago lies at the southern tip of the Caribbean island chain. On a clear day, it is easy to spot the Venezuelan coast. Trinidad and Tobago has a unique economic status within the Caribbean region. While other islands’ economies rely heavily on tourism and foreign banking, Trinidad and Tobago’s wealth is tied to natural oil reserves and an active petroleum industry (Henry & Melville, 2001). Like most Caribbean countries, Trinidad and Tobago has a mono-cultural economy. As a result, its

---

66 Other colonial powers followed suit (i.e., Denmark, France, Holland, Spain, Sweden), the last being Spain, who abolished slavery in Cuba in 1879 (Rogozinski, 1994).
67 Smaller groups of Portuguese and Chinese nationals also came to the area as indentured labour.
economic prosperity is linked to fluctuating market prices. However, the main economic difference between Trinidad and Tobago and the rest of the Caribbean countries is the value of this resource.

Trinidad and Tobago gained self-governance in 1956, independence in 1962, and adopted a republican constitution in 1978. This last act severed all constitutional ties to Britain, marking the end to Trinidad and Tobago’s colonial past (Higman, 2011). The country was so eager to distance itself from its colonial past, that the Williams government dismantled much of the public infrastructure that was put in place by the British, including a national rail system. In spite of this split, Trinidad and Tobago remains a part of the British Commonwealth. This Commonwealth connection plays a significant role with respect to foreign investment and national development (Tennyson, 1988).

The population of Trinidad and Tobago is nearly equally divided between Indo and Afro-Trinidadians. Government of Trinidad and Tobago 2000 Census indicates: Indian (South Asian) 40%, African 37.5%, mixed 20.5%, other 1.2%, unspecified 0.8%. Unlike other Caribbean nations (e.g., Guyana), this divide has not led to overt racial confrontation within the country (MacDonald, 1986). Instead, racial or ethnic tensions persist within a “wink and nod” mentality of the average Trinidandian and Tobagonian (Kahn, 2004). For example, it is not uncommon for Indo-Trinidadians to have Afro-Trinidadian as close friends, while at the same time attributing social problems (e.g., crime) to “certain types of people”. Class distinctions add another layer of complexity to the national identity. As Trinidad and Tobago increases its gross national product, the divide between rich and poor has become more pronounced (Braithwaite, 2001).
Evidence of the true complexity of ethnic and economic differences was evident in the 2010 National elections. Here, the People’s National Movement (PNM) (historically Afro-Trinidadian) and the United National Congress (UNC) (historically Indo-Trinidadian) downplayed any racial tension and made efforts to highlight their parties’ racial diversity. At the same time, each party sought to establish itself as the voice of the average citizen, while depicting the other party as elitist and out of touch. Finally, while Trinidad and Tobago markets itself as place for everyone, there is a strong current of resentment towards foreigners. This is true with regards to the influx of illegal Venezuelan and other Caribbean migrants. It is also true with regards to the hiring of (white) foreigners into high-profile positions. Following a PNM victory in 2010, a new chief of police was hired. The hiring of a foreign police chief was met with much criticism. The criticisms were direct both towards the chief’s credentials and to his ethnicity. On the latter point, commentary wavered between outright disappointments in hiring a foreigner to police the country to a more troubling xenophobic attitude towards the hiring of a white foreigner (Ghany, 2012).

A 2010 CARICOM report on youth development identifies education, employment, migration, crime and violence, and health (sexual health, drug abuse, mental health) as key issues and obstacles to the future development of the region. One of the interesting element of this report was an acknowledgement of the role that sport can play in addressing these issues. Sport plays a major role in Caribbean and Trinidad and Tobago’s culture. Building on sport’s popularity, a number of different countries (e.g., Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, United States) and international organizations

68 While the national sport is football, cricket easily rivals it as the nation’s most popular sport.
(e.g., UNICEF, UNESCO, Commonwealth Games Association) have been implementing or supporting development through sport initiatives in Trinidad and Tobago for the past 20 years. In the past five years, there has been an effort to transfer the implementation and management of these programs from foreign hands to local experts. Within this context, TTASPE has established itself as primary hub for development-through-sport in the Caribbean (Wilson & Cameron, 2010).

4.4. Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education

The Trinidad and Tobago Alliance for Sport and Physical Education [TTASPE] was founded in 2002. This non-profit organization focuses on developing people and communities through sport and physical education. TTASPE was founded by Mark Mungal, Andre Collins, and Marlon Thompson. Over the past ten years, TTASPE has grown from delivering physical education support to local schools to become a central figure in development-through-sport in the Caribbean region. TTASPE’s approach to sport-for-development is typical of other Southern NGOs in that it focuses on instructor training, child education, and community capacity building, with a specific focus on HIV/AIDS, physical literacy, gender equity, and empowerment (Kay, 2009). It now delivers programs in several Caribbean countries (see Figure 2:). It also holds a seat on key regional and international sport and physical education and development-through-sport bodies. However, the majority of its initiatives remain in Trinidad and Tobago.

---

69 Marlon has since moved on to work for UNICEF Trinidad and Tobago.
Figure 2: TTASPE's Program Reach in the Caribbean

🌟 - Country of operation
From its beginning, TTASPE has worked closely with local and international organizations in order to develop and deliver a variety of development-through-sport projects and services. Currently, TTASPE runs four projects: Game ON! Youth Sports, Jump Rope For Heart, Kicking AIDS Out!, Youth Friendly Spaces, and Ready & Able. All of these projects, save Youth Friendly Healthy Spaces, are delivered in support of existing physical education or community programming. The Youth Friendly Healthy Spaces project has a larger mandate to provide sport and entrepreneurial support to whole communities. In most cases, several of these projects are delivered for the same organizations. For example, an elementary school might have TTASPE delivering Game On! Youth Sports, Jump Rope for Heart, and Ready & Able projects. TTASPE’s services are listed as: leadership, team building, life skills development, physical education curriculum development, community sport programming, youth sport programming, anti-doping education, sport club development, sport organization assessment, and monitoring and evaluation (TTASPE, 2012).

TTASPE’s roles in development-through-sport and its various partnerships make it a good case for this study. As a hub organization TTASPE, is engaged in a number of development partnerships. A unique feature of TTASPE’s partnership roles is that it receives funding, support, and direction from large organizations, placing TTASPE in the traditional “recipient” role of the donor-recipient development relationship while at the same time also providing support and direction to community-based development through sport programs and projects, thus placing it in the “donor” role. Also, TTASPE expressed a desire to gain a better understanding of its various partnerships and roles (TTASPE, 2010), ensuring their active participation and interest in its results.
5. DATA ANALYSIS

The trick is to keep your eyes on what is in front of you, and allow
justifications to come to an end inside your life, and inside the lives of
others to whom you are connected (Nagel, 1987, p.100)

This chapter provides analysis of the primary data sources. The analysis is broken
down into three sections: 1) Partnership Overview, which provides a sketch of the
breadth of TTASPE’s partnerships, demographic information on the interviewees, while
showing the existing links between TTASPE and its partners; 2) Partnership Background,
which offers a summary of each partner’s organizational focus, general partnership
position, and specific partnership with TTASPE; and 3) Partnership Factors, which gives
an overview of the characteristics and environmental influences that shape development
partnerships.

5.1. Partnership Overview

5.1.1. Interviewees’ Demographics

TTASPE’s partners were identified through discussion between TTASPE and the
researcher. TTASPE was asked on several occasions prior to beginning the interviews to
identify organizations that it identified as partners. TTASPE identified two partnership
criteria. First, the organization had to have demonstrated a longer-term commitment to
TTASPE (one time collaboration was not acceptable). For example, the Australian Sport
Commission had been working with TTASPE since it began and any school group was
considered a partner as part of TTASPE’s ongoing work with the education system.
Second, the organization had to shared similar values. For example United Way Trinidad
and Tobago was considered a partner and Nestle was not. Whereas, both United Way
and Trinidad and Tobago providing mainly funding support for TTASPE initiatives, Nestle was described more interested in funding events that were more about product placement than community support.70 These discussions netted a list of 15 key partner organizations, and 28 potential interviewees. All the partner organizations were contacted, first by TTASPE, and second by the researcher. Only the Government of Trinidad and Tobago (i.e., Ministry of Education, Ministry of Youth and Sport) was unable to participate in the study. Interviewee numbers (26 as primary data points) varied, based on availability and organizational structure (some organizations had multiple points of contact with TTASPE) (see Appendix D).

All but one interview was conducted by phone or face-to-face.71 There were efforts made to contact the interviewees prior to the interview. However, I was only able to connect with nineteen of the 26 interviewees prior to the interview. There was even distribution between genders: 13 males and 13 females. Interviewees’ education levels ranged from secondary school diploma to doctoral degree, with the majority holding a bachelor’s degree. Post-secondary education specializations included: education, physical education, business, sociology, and science. The partnership length between TTASPE and its partners varied from organization to organization and interviewee to interviewee (see Appendix E). The organizational position of the interviewees is included also. Finally, the top-heavy interviewee list (e.g., manager, officer, president) is indicative of TTASPE’s program delivery orientation.

70 It is worth noting that TTASPE had not been work with Nestle funding for the past two years, but had recently re-engaged in preliminary conversations.
71 The e-mail interview was extremely brief. After reviewing the interview questions, the interviewee did not consider TTASPE to be a partner. Also, one interview was not recorded at the request of the interviewee.
5.2. Partnership Links

TTASPE partnerships are organizationally and geographically diverse (see Appendix E). This made it an ideal choice as a partnership hub (see Figure 3: ). However, TTASPE is not the only link between several of these organizations (see Figure 4: ). In all cases, these inter-organizational links were established prior to any partnership with TTASPE. Also, each organization referenced other “partner” organizations that were important to their operations or had an impact on their relationship with TTASPE (i.e., government ministries, implementing organizations, sponsors, or sport bodies). Discussion of these partnerships is included to illustrate points, but the organizations are not included as primary data sources.
Figure 3: TTASPE Partnership Hub
Figure 4: Partnerships between TTASPE's Partners
5.2.1. Resource Exchange

Over the course of the interview, respondents were asked to identify what they gave to their partners and what they received in return. Error! Reference source not found. F provides a list of exchanged resources. The main focus is on resource exchange between TTASPE and its partners; however, partners also mentioned exchanges with their other partners. Points of exchange are grouped into: physical resources, knowledge, operational efficiency and recognition (see Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Intern-support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Intern-support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Impact Stories, Participation Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Financial Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Program Delivery, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Support</td>
<td>Local Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Local Knowledge, Best Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
<td>Official Policy to Leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Practical Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Evaluation and Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Sourcing</td>
<td>Recruitment Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
<td>Shared plan for regional delivery, evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Point</td>
<td>Access to participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Permission</td>
<td>Permission to work with specific populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Building a Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Support for Profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. Partnership Background

This section provides a brief introduction to TTASPE and its partners. Beginning with TTASPE, discussion of each organization is framed as follows: a) the organizational history and focus, b) an understanding of development, c) the use and understanding of partnership, and d) an account of the partnership between the organization and TTASPE.

5.3.1. TTASPE

TTASPE’s mission is “to support the development of practitioners and professionals in sport, physical education and allied fields in their capacity to deliver quality experiences to their respective target populations” (TTASPE, 2011). Over the past ten years, it has grown from “two guys” in a Toyota Sunny delivering high quality volleyball programs in Trinidad and Tobago to a 12-person staff that is seen as a leader in sport for development (personal communication, 2010).

TTASPE’s staff offered three interpretations of development. The most common interpretation was that development is activity that provides an opportunity for communal engagement and positive personal growth. TTASPE applies this understanding of development to the communities it works with, its partners, and itself. For example, as TTASPE states:

Do you consider TTASPE to be a development organization?

Ya.

And why would that be?

Because on so many levels the organization itself is developing, but it provides the opportunity for others within the community or those that
really communicate or interact with kids to develop themselves, either within the program or through other opportunities.

The other interpretations of development included: direct reference to the UN Millennium Development Goals and framing development as a process of goal setting and honest reflection. Under this last interpretation, development can occur individually or collectively, and when it does occur, it includes balances and personal wants and desires with acceptance of wide social responsibility. As TTASPE explained: “the whole process of living is about development and about reflecting and about progress. It is a balance of ideals and reality.”

TTASPE does not have an official partnership definition. Unofficially, it differentiates between partners based on geo-political position and those based on relationship quality. Analysis of TTASPE’s interview data is divided into two parts: part one addresses the interviews with TTASPE’s executive members; part two addresses the interviews with its Sport Development Officers.

Executive Officers

TTASPE has adopted a holistic (physical, social, emotional, intellectual, spiritual) approach to sport as a tool for developing human capacity. This approach stems from the executive’s experiential physical education background. The approach acknowledges that sport can provide positive and negative experiences. For these reasons, TTASPE tries to ensure that each of its experiences is fun, provides an opportunity for success, facilitates learning, and encourages inclusive participation. TTASPE draws on authentic sport experiences to create guided learning opportunities for children and youth.
Importantly, these authentic sport experiences involve a real-life opportunity for self-
discovery and relationship exploration (e.g., teammates, coaches, opposition).

At the beginning of the interview, TTASPE executive officers made a point of clarifying their partnership stance: relationships, not partnerships, are central to TTASPE success:

Because we also feel that relationships are like the glue, the core of anything that we do. So your research is about partnership, but for us it is really about relationships…. We don’t want to have a partnership with an agency. We want’a have a relationship with you…. A relationship that is based on principles. A relationship that is based on meaningfulness.

The difference between a relationship and a partnership is that a relationship is dynamic and a partnership is not. The term “partner” operates as a general label for all of the organizations that TTASPE works with. Each partner consists of an individual (or individuals), and it is here that TTASPE focuses its efforts on building personal relationships as a means of strengthening organizational partnerships.

TTASPE’s partnership with ASOP (Australian Sport Outreach Program) is a good example of the link between personal relationships and organizational partnerships. Before TTASPE became a formal organization, its executive members were lobbying the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education to change its approach to physical education. At the same time, ASOP had a development officer in the region with a similar mandate. Working independently, both TTASPE’s executive and the ASOP officer were frustrated with the government’s response. TTASPE’s executive did not have the political clout to effect change, and ASOP struggled to make connections within the governments.
Through a chance meeting, their personal connection and organizational interests led to their taking joint action. Just as important, their meeting established reciprocal support for a new way of physical education delivery: “So when ___ came in, we started to interact with her and we started to realize that …uhm, these ideas she is sharing is really [ideas] what we ourselves had” (TTASPE). This early relationship proved to be an important catalyst for TTASPE’s formal creation.

The positive connection and action between TTASPE’s executive and the ASOP officer encouraged TTASPE’s executives to take action on their ambitions. This evolution provided TTASPE with an identity and structure that made its approach local government and international organizations more familiar. Whereas, for example, the ASOP officer was able to link with TTASPE’s executives as individuals, ASOP was unable to partner formally with individuals. Therefore, the organizational partnership was a direct result of the personal relationship between TTASPE’s executive and the ASOP officer. In the following years, this personal relationship was the bond that held the organizational partnership together. As will be discussed later, it is only now that ASOP has extended that bond to TTASPE as a whole.

TTASPE is also aware that personal relationships cannot stand in the way of organizational partnerships. As a TTASPE executive stated, “You don’t burn your bridges.” As long as a partnership provides some sort of strategic value, then personal relationships can, and should, be de-emphasized: “we seek to establish relationships on value. What value can you bring to the work that we do?”
Sport Development Officers

When asked about partners, the sport development officers tended to start by identifying organizations that they worked with and describing each organization’s particular contribution of function. A typical response would be: “The Australian Sport Commission, which is one of our main funders…. Commonwealth Games Canada, they also contributed to the development of the Game On! Manual…. The World Anti-Doping Agency, WADA, they contributed to helping develop the life-skills elements in the initial stages.” Only one officer spoke of personal relationships before mentioning organizational partnership: “you know, the only other body I can think of is UNICEF, mainly because of my relationship with X.”

When asked specifically whether program participants were considered partners, sport officers’ responses varied from a definite yes to more nuanced description of relationship types. The nuances descriptions are summarized into three type: 1) partnership, which is based on formal working agreements with clear outcomes and goals; 2) network relationships\(^{72}\), which include any organization that TTASPE was linked to, but did not have a formal working agreement with; and 3) mentorship relationships\(^{73}\), which encompass any situation in which TTASPE took on a leadership or trainer role.

In spite of these variations, there was consensus that no one partnership or relationship was more important than another. As one sport development officer stated, “you reach a point in terms of appreciating relationships for what they are.” Each partner

\(^{72}\) “we do not deal with tilapia farming… but from the network of people that we know, we did get in contact with people who do do tilapia farming.”

\(^{73}\) “…the partners you are trying to [affect] change in.”
brings something different to the table, something that is essential in its own way. At the same time, it was also acknowledged that some partnerships are stronger than others, based on the level of philosophical and operational alignment between the organizations. For example, a number of sport development officers identified a difference between funding-based partnerships with organizations that had a development-through-sport mandate and those with other focuses (i.e., corporate social responsibility). Differences were also noted with respect to the collaborative spirit of partners. Partners that expressed a willingness to work with, as opposed to direct TTASPE’s efforts were viewed as being stronger: “So it is about partners thinking that we have equal value. So that is why that relationship works. And in the other instance partners don’t think that we are coming with an equal value. So the relationship is different.”

5.3.2. Commonwealth Games Canada

Commonwealth Games Canada (CGC) is the national governing body for the Commonwealth Games Organization, and an active member of the Canadian sport community. CGC is committed to strengthening sport in Canada and throughout the Commonwealth. In line with its core values of caring, justice, and development\(^\text{74}\), CGC has established an international development-through-sport branch (CGC IDS). Operating since 1993, this branch has a dual sport development and development-through-sport mandate. Linked to TTASPE through internship placements and regional sport bodies (i.e., CARICOM, OCASPE), CGC IDS also has an official partnership agreement with TTASPE regarding its work with the Kicking AIDS Out! Network.

\(^{74}\) Dr. Malloy was instrumental in establishing these core values.
CGC continues to work towards an organizational understanding of development. In general terms, development involves capacity building and leadership. It is about “leaving people better off than they were before” (e.g., socially, economically, or personally) (CGC). Theoretically, CGC works with local partners to provide assistance in meeting their goals. Practically, it helps their local partners to identify goals and provide the financial and administrative support to help them achieve these goals. CGC does not use the terms “developed” and “undeveloped” and views its organizational improvement as a form of development.

CGC IDS identifies partnership as the best way for developing and delivering effective international programs. CGC IDS does not have an official partnership definition. However, it does make a clear distinction between four different types of operational partners:

1) Funding partners--provide the long-term support needed to develop sustainable IDS programs throughout the Commonwealth;

2) International partners--share expertise and best practices, support each other’s initiatives, and work together to ensure their goals, using sport as a tool for social development, are achieved;

3) Implementing Partners--use their expertise to create and deliver sustainable development-through-sport programs suited to local conditions and culture;

4) Internship Host Partners--create a safe environment for our interns to learn, grow, and develop while ensuring integration into the local culture, community, and organization over the course of their development-through-sport internship (CGC IDS, 2012).
It is interesting to note that the inclusion of funding partners represents a clear organizational shift in the way that CGC IDS speaks about its partners. At the time of the interviews, CGC IDS was unsure whether their funders were actually partners. One interviewee suggested that funders were partners. Another interviewee felt that CGC IDS was seen as a contractual delivery agency by its funders. This distinction became problematic when CGC interviewees were asked to clarify the difference between the contractual relationship that CGC IDS had with its funders and the contractual partnerships that CGC IDS had with its implementing partners:

**And again, how is that different from the partnerships that you are entering?**

Well, only in the sense that when we are dealing with our in-country partnership…. I guess it is the same except that in that case we hold the upper hand because we hold the money…. You know, I ensure that what we say we are going to do is in line with their [Government of Canada] policy, in the same way that with our partners in the field, we have to make sure that--not what they do, but the parts of what they do that we fund are congruent with our policy and our objectives (CGC).

One of the reasons for this confusion may have to do with the level of engagement among the different types of partners. Funding partnerships were based on proposal writing and report submission. Implementing partnerships were more hands-on as CGC IDS provided funding, capacity building, and program development supports. In short, partnership was seen as a function of personal interaction and support: “To me, just an update, it is not really a partnership.”
Finally, partnership represents both a philosophical and practical shift in the way that CGC IDS engages with local NGOs and organizations. Initially, CGC IDS focused on providing staff to establish and run programs in developing countries. Soon, this shifted to providing specific training services to existing organizations. Currently, the CGC IDS focus is on capacity building, which includes: skills development, program support, intern-support, and financial assistance. Within this framework, partnership is seen as a way to address dependency issues and combat the power imbalance in most donor-recipient relations:

If I was to set up a new partnership, the first question I would ask is not “how much money do you need?” but, “what is it that you want to achieve in a month, a year, in five years?” And then sit with them and strategize how they want to see their organization develop.

…we work together on achieving something, on a plan that is what the partner, and what the partner organization, in the field, want to see happen. Not what CGC wants to see happen (CGC).

5.3.3. **Australian Sport Commission – (ASOP)**

Since 1998, the Australian Sports Commission (ASC), through support from the Australian Agency for International Development, has been supporting the Australian Sport Outreach Program (ASOP). ASOP, which is managed by the International Relations section of the ASC, supports grassroots sport-based development and aims to foster broader and deeper people-to-people links between countries through sport. More precisely, the ASOP provides grants for international community sports development
programs in the Pacific, southern Africa, and the Caribbean. Since 2003, TTASPE has taken on the responsibility of delivering ASC programming in the Caribbean.

ASOP’s understanding of development is tied directly to its funding source, AusAid. As such, it does not have a specific definition of development, but several different interpretations based on Australia’s development goals for a particular country or region (i.e., health outcomes, gender outcomes, education outcomes, or youth outcomes). This community outcome focus was adopted in 2006, and, notes ASOP, “has meant a period of adjusting and getting used to a different way of doing things.”

ASOP does not have an official partnership definition, but does view partnership and partnership building as key to its development agenda:

I think [partnership] is the critical thing…. But I think, in terms of actually achieving things, the ground work, much of the ground work that you need to do is actually getting the relationship with the people right in the first place before you ever look at effecting or having any behaviour changes.

They need to know you. You need to know them. (ASOP)

In this respect, partnership appears to be contextually specific and dynamic. This type of development approach is not new to ASOP. ASOP has been working collaboratively with implementing organizations for over ten years. However, what has changed is the formal nature of the relationship. What were once informal discussions have become formally documented processes: “I think what it represents is a new approach to actually documenting what we are going to do…. So, we are actually at the stage now where we sit down together and do these things. Whereas before it might have been more laissez-faire about the way the whole thing is approached” (ASOP).
ASOP has identified four key partnership types. First, it works with AusAid as its primary funding partner. Historically, this relationship was more hands-off, but in the last few years, AusAid has had an increased interest in ensuring that ASOP programs were more closely aligned with its policy and procedures. Second, the hands-off approach has shifted ASOP’s focus to government-to-government (e.g., Government of Trinidad and Tobago, CARICOM) relationships and liaising with specific ministries (e.g., health, education, sport, youth) in support of AusAid’s existing inter-governmental initiatives. Third, ASOP has begun to partner with other commonwealth sport-for-development organizations (i.e., CGC IDS, UK Sport) in order to reduce service duplication and administrative burden on program implementers. This working relationship is fairly recent, as historically these organizations were more combative: “We don’t want them to see what we are doing in this area. There was no sense of cooperation. Over time we have matured in our approach…. We can do things together. We can all fly our national flag.” Fourth, ASOP partners with local NGOs and sport bodies to support and deliver sport and development-through-sport initiatives.

5.3.4. **UK Sport**

Accountable to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, UK Sport is responsible for managing high performance sport in Britain. As part of a Royal Charter mandate, UK Sport established UK Sport International. UK Sport International focuses on: a) influencing agenda and policy settings, b) supporting system development, c) using sport to enhance the quality of life for young people, and d) contributing towards a knowledge economy. UK Sport International offers programs in six areas, which include a range of sport development, development-through-sport, and research objectives.
UK Sport does not have an official development definition. “We have definitions of our work,” stated UK Sport, “but not what is development.” The interviewee also defined development from a personal perspective. On a personal level, development meant moving a particular situation (e.g. community, school, or ministry) from one defined point to another (e.g. literacy, health).

UK Sport is clear that it is not able to meet its responsibilities in isolation and is therefore committed to working with a wide range of sports and partner bodies (UK Sport, 2011). In line with this mandate, UK Sport International recognizes partnerships in four different areas (UK Sport, 2011a):

1) Government Level Partnership—government-to-government bilateral agreements;
2) Supranational and International Partnership—institutional support through advocacy, knowledge sharing, and learning;
3) National Partnership—support and advice for UK National Governing Bodies engaging in activities overseas;
4) Higher Education Partnership—linked to developing links between UK and overseas institutions;
5) Non-governmental and Community-based Partnership—providing quality support to organizations to deliver sport development and development-through-sport programs.

TTASPE is linked to UK Sport through government level and supranational partnerships.

Most important to the UK Sport International is that partnership represents a shift away from traditional donor-recipient relationships. UK Sport recounts a typical donor-recipient interaction:
We at UK Sport, in our nice office in London, say: “here you go. Have X thousands of pounds to deliver this project. We will check up on you twice a year and you will have to give us annual accounts at the end of the year”. We are the ones with the money, therefore you will do what we say you will do. Now, I would like to think that my organization has never behaved...that it is never that black and white...but this is the more traditional way.

Partnership, on the other hand, is a shift towards two-way contribution. According to this model, financial support is only one of the contributions made by UK Sport. Knowledge building and knowledge sharing are equally important.

5.3.5. **UNICEF**

UNICEF is the largest child’s rights organization in the world. Sport-for-development is only one of its many divisions. UNICEF’s sport-for-development efforts are grounded in its mission to ensure that every child has the right to recreation and play in a safe and healthy environment. UNICEF works exclusively through partnerships and collaborative relationships in order to deliver on its mandate.

UNICEF approaches development through the UN Millennium Development Goals. Development, therefore, is defined as specific goal achievement. These goals are addressed through systematic, planned, and evidence-based strategic processes aimed at promoting positive and measurable individual behaviour and social change through programs, policy advocacy, and humanitarian work (UNICEF, 2011).

In 2009, UNICEF published an official partnership framework. The framework follows the UN General Assembly resolution 62/211, which defines partnership as
“voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both public and non-public, where all participants agree to work together to achieve common purpose or undertake a specific task, and, as mutually agreed, to share risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits.” Based on this definition, partnerships can be formal and fall into one of four categories: corporate, civil society, global program, or knowledge and media (UNICEF, 2011). As a leader in development partnerships, UNICEF has established guiding principles and operational guidelines for all formal partnerships.

UNICEF, too, stresses the use of partner over its traditional label as a funding agency. As UNICEF states:

We often hate to be characterized as a funding agency because the philosophy of UNICEF is we don’t enter into any space empty. If we enter into a space, we enter with an NGO or government--that there is not expertise there. So in terms of what we define partnership as…we both need to come together and see a particular need, and then we decide on what best way that we can work together towards that. So our partnership is really based on leveraging the strengths of each other.

UNICEF does not have a long-term partnership agreement with TTASPE but has worked with TTASPE on a two-year pilot project for developing child-friendly communities, and is working with TTASPE and other agencies to create a number of youth-friendly spaces.

5.3.6. CARICOM

The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) is the principal administrative body for the community of 15 member and 5 associate member states. Its mission is to “provide

---

75 UNICEF does work closely with national government and regional governing bodies. However, these relationships are covered under a different agreement.
dynamic leadership and service in partnership with Community Institutions and groups towards the attainment of a viable, internationally competitive and sustainable community, with improved quality of life for all” (CARICOM, 2011). CARICOM does not have an official partnership definition. Unofficially, partnership is interpreted as collaborative action: “They know what is required. They know what needs to be done…. They know we can’t do it alone so they partner with us and get it done” (CARICOM).

CARICOM measures development through economic indices, such as, gross domestic product, in order to rank its members as “developed,” “developing,” or “undeveloped.” It also adopts the directives of the UN Millennium Development Goals. Unofficially, development was defined as a self-reflective state of being (CARICOM). In this case, economic measures were seen to mask social factors such as literacy or crime. This comment was targeted at what was seen as a largely unjustified distinction between first and third world nations. Arguable, economics was viewed as a hollow measure of development.

Unlike other high level partners, CARICOM does not provide financial assistance. Its main contributions are policy direction, establishing regional standards, and linking organizations with complementary interests and objectives. CARICOM provides guidance in a number of areas: economic development, health, education, skill transfer, and sport. Its sport focus takes in sport development and development-through-sport initiatives. CARICOM was instrumental in establishing OCASPE and is partnered with TTASPE to establish a set of curriculum directives for physical education within its community. The partnership spans all of TTASPE’s years of operation.
5.3.7. **OCASPE**

In 1994, CARICOM established the Organization of Caribbean Administrators of Sport and Physical Education (OCASPE). Its newly drafted role is to contribute to the development of sports and physical education in the region through collaboration of local, regional and international initiatives and to function as an oversight organization, for advocacy, coordination, policy development and implementation of youth, physical education and sport for development programming in the region. (OCASPE, 2010)

Much like CARICOM, OCASPE’s primary function is to establish sport and physical education policy and standards. In the past few years, it has taken a peripheral role in development-through-sport. This has been linked to poor financial support (i.e., some members have not paid their dues) and operational conflicts with sport bodies and NGOs (i.e., failure to deliver, and personality clashes).

Given its current state of restructuring, OCASPE does not have a working definition of development.

OCASPE has had various interactions with TTASPE over the years. Both organizations have been represented on advisory committees and been part of regional discussions on sport and physical education. In 2010, CARICOM began a series of discussions aimed at reviving and refocusing OCASPE. TTASPE was a part of this initiative. Though TTASPE identifies OCASPE as a partner, OCASPE identifies TTASPE as an associate member organization. The true nature of their relationship continues to unfold.
5.3.8. Government of Trinidad and Tobago

There are two main points of contact between the government of Trinidad and Tobago and TTASPE: the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sport (MYAS). The Ministry of Education’s vision is to “be a high performing, dynamic and vibrant organization, responsive to the needs of stakeholders and [sic] which works collaboratively, efficiently and effectively to educate and develop an intelligent, versatile, productive and well rounded child” (Ministry of Education, 2011). MYAS seeks to “[empower] young people to make informed choices so that they can lead meaningful enjoyable lives and contribute to the sustainable development of Trinidad and Tobago” (MYAS, 2011). Neither the ministry nor the government of Trinidad and Tobago has an official partnership statement.

TTASPE identified both ministries as key partners. Both ministries were contacted on several occasions. Though support for the research was indicated, neither ministry was able to provide a point of contact for discussion of their relationship with TTASPE. Through further discussion with TTASPE’s sport development officers, it became clear that while ministry approval was essential for TTASPE to be able to work in schools, most of their work was done with more local support (e.g., teachers, principals). Once this support was established, programs were run and activity reports were then shared with ministry officials for after-the-fact approval. TTASPE’s executive officers also noted that there was a great deal of friction, in particular with the Ministry of Education, during the period just prior to and following TTASPE’s inception. Also, it is worth noting that there was a change in government while this study was conducted.
This shift in power and policy may have been a major contributing factor in the ministries’ abilities to comment on their work with TTASPE.

5.3.9. **Tobago House of Assembly**

The Tobago House of Assembly is Tobago’s regional government body. Through the Division of Education, and Youth Affairs and Sport, TTASPE is in regular contact with the Department of Education, the Department of Sport, and the Department of Youth Affairs regarding: teacher education, athlete drug-awareness, and creating child-friendly communities and youth-friendly spaces.

The division’s mission is to “provide an environment that promotes and supports holistic development and lifelong learning through relevant, innovative and well conceived educational, sporting and youth oriented programs, thus enabling all persons to achieve their full potential as productive citizens” (THA, 2011). The House of Assembly, the division, and the departments do not have an official partnership statement. Over the course of the interviews, relational descriptions focused on stakeholder relations.

THA identified TTASPE as a key stakeholder: “TTASPE is a key stakeholder in that it fills a need that I don’t think the Ministry of Education, nationally, and even the Ministry of Youth and Sport Affairs have done a good job in.” This statement indicates that a partner or stakeholder is an organization that brings something to the table that allows the departments, division, or House of Assembly to address its particular mandate. Other key stakeholders included teachers, principals, parents, and local sport bodies. Though these groups are important, they do not have the same level of commitment to sport for development as TTASPE. As THA explains, “we have fewer and fewer
principals who understand the value of sport. So you now have a lack of principals and teachers who are even willing to be a member of these communities…nevertheless, they are key stakeholders” (THA).

5.3.10. Schools

Schools are the primary delivery point for TTASPE’s programs. There are seven school districts in Trinidad and Tobago. Each district falls directly under the Ministry of Education, and has a number of primary and secondary schools. Schools are run on a continuum between private and public. At the primary level, government assisted schools are denominational (i.e., Catholic, Hindu, Muslim) but open to the public. There is a Ministry mission statement; however, each school also has its own school philosophy and vision. As Schools states, “we have our own vision, and our vision is to be a leading professional learn’n community. So we want to be a leader at all times.”

In a school setting, development was understood as enhancing personal skills and abilities for students to become productive members of society. Their programs sought to provide a structured learning environment in which students could experience meaningful opportunities for personal exploration and growth.

Official protocol for working in schools requires approval from the Ministry of Education before engaging with schools. However, this protocol is not usually followed. In most cases, teachers invite TTASPE to initiate programs in their schools. Then, teachers approach their principal, who seeks approval from the Ministry. Like THA, schools do not speak of TTASPE as a partner, but as a stakeholder. Schools do not have an official stakeholder statement.
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76 The same protocol exists in St. Lucia.
Stakeholders are unofficially defined as individuals or organizations that are part of the school’s community and who play or wish to play a supportive role. There is a sense that all stakeholders need to work together, or at least provide support in line with the school vision. “We have to take initiative,” states Schools, “and invite everybody on the outside to be affiliated with the school, so that we can get support. And it works. It really works like that.” While there is no strict difference between stakeholder types or expectations, the schools did identify key stakeholders as the Ministry, the business community, the parent teacher association, church groups, and outside groups (e.g., TTASPE, Red Cross).

5.3.11. Community Organizations

In its first years of operation, TTASPE worked with a variety of community groups to provide one-off training initiatives or other special events (e.g., sports day, HIV/AIDS education, leadership training). In 2007, TTASPE expanded its community organization involvement to include the UNICEF mandate to create child-friendly communities and youth-friendly spaces. Under this mandate, TTASPE worked more intensely with community groups in order to help them identify broad community needs and possible ways to address these needs. These projects included economic development, community health, and safety. However, the main focus was on establishing a youth-focused community recreation association. This work placed TTASPE in a new partnership role. TTASPE now had to think through many of the development issues that it faced with their international partners, though this time in the position of capacity builder (Wilson & Cameron, 2010).
When the data was collected, TTASPE had established one community association, Eastside Dynamic Achievement Culture and Sport Club (EDACS), and was exploring the potential for two more similar initiatives in Tobago. EDACS does not have an official development statement. However, the interviewees described what they saw as signs of development. Development was about “[putting] a little fishing village on the map…about feeling proud.” Development included: building the community, establishing and meeting goals, self-expression, and self-confidence. Most importantly, it was about providing a positive example and experience that would inspire youth to become active community members.77

The common link between these organizations is a desire to help youth to meet their goals and express themselves: in short, healthy youth development. Interviewees for this partner set were done with one-off and community group partners. Neither had an official partnership definition. Both confirmed the importance of partnership in achieving their organizational mandate: “Well, it is very important,” stated EDACS, “It is important for me, as a partner to come and support the group [community club].” This sentiment was echoed by TTASPE: “Extremely important. I mean, hhhm, you can’t do this work without key people around you to support, to support the whole process, so support the whole movement.” The community club also noted the importance of supporting one’s partner: “Ya, we help our partners a lot…due to some of the HIV/Aids walks and some of the programs that we did” (EDACS). Finally, it was clear from the interviews that these organizations identified as much, if not more, with the personal
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77 “So when my son comes up, he might be able to say: ‘my daddy is someone who is known in the community and is working in the community and outside, and I want to follow in his footsteps’” (EDACS).
relationship formed through the partnership. EDACS, for example, spoke on several occasions of the sense of personal loss when the project coordinator moved out of the community: “We was cry’n. He just left. I don’t understand.”

5.3.12. International Alliance for Youth Sports (IAYS)

The IAYS is the international arm of the National Alliance for Youth Sports (NAYS). Founded in 1993, this United States-based not for profit organization seeks to make the sports experience safe, fun, and healthy for all children (NAYS, 2011). IAYS was founded in 2003 with a mandate to help build the value of sports and enhance the youth sports experience for children worldwide (IAYS, 2011).

As a network-based organization, IAYS focuses on building a supportive team atmosphere. In doing so, IAYS makes explicit mention of the value of “forming a strategic partnership with organizations that contribute or are in support of [their] mission” (IAYS, 2011). Differentiating between sponsor, volunteers, and communities served, IAYS identifies two kinds of partners. First, it identifies Founding Partners in Action. This is a small advisory group that plays an instrumental goal in shaping IAYS program offerings and delivery methods. Second, it identifies Partners in Action. This group is much larger, and includes a range of organizations from Ex-Freight (a shipping company) to St. Kitt’s Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Culture.

The relationship between TTASPE and IAYS is not entirely clear. IAYS began its work with TTASPE through a chance conference meeting between the IAYS and TTASPE presidents. The personal connection and organizational parallels resulted in TTASPE’s becoming a part of IAYS’s Founding Council (personal communication, 2010). Through this seat, TTASPE was contracted to develop the Game On! program for
IAYS. In 2010, IAYS began to sell the Game On! program as a revenue source to support its programs. TTASPE asked for and was denied a percentage of the profits. However, it was granted permission to use the Game On! program free of charge. When IAYS was contacted for this research, its responded as follows:

In brief, our relationship with TTASPE has been an ever changing one over the last several years. While both have as a goal, I believe, to improve the lives of children through sports, we are both quite independent of each other in our operations.

In spite of this response, TTASPE still is listed as one of IAYS’s Founding Partners in Action and the “Our Partners” section of the IAYS website displays a photo of the IAYS and TTASPE presidents shaking hands (IAYS, April, 2011).

5.3.13. **Kicking AIDS Out! Network**

Kicking AIDS Out! Network is a collaboration between international development-through-sport organizations working to use sport and physical activity as a means of raising awareness about HIV and AIDS and motivating positive behaviour changes in youth (Kicking AIDS Out!, 2011). Kicking AIDS Out! is not so much a program as it is an approach. The Kicking AIDS Out! Network provides like-minded organizations with the opportunity to discuss best practices, develop curriculum, and share support. The Kicking AIDS Out! Network does not deliver programs, but it has established a leadership-training program that focuses on how sport can be used to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS in conjunction with existing sport and development-through-sport programs.

---

78 The Secretariat is housed in Cape Town South Africa.
The Kicking AIDS Out! Network has made a conscious decision not to define development. Focused on spreading a concept, the Kicking AIDS Out! Network allows its members to define development based on local demands. This design approach provides a high level of flexibility to its members, and fosters local involvement and ownership.

Under the network umbrella, the Kicking AIDS Out! Network recognizes three types of organizational links (Kicking AIDS Out!, 2011). Network partners are funding agencies and donors that provide strategic, financial, programming, and/or organizational assistance to members. The Kicking AIDS Out! Network’s current partners are UK Sport, Commonwealth Games Canada (CGC IDS), and the Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF). Network members, NGOs, and/or registered development-through-sport organizations are currently implementing sport and physical activity programs to achieve relevant development goals. Members are expected to integrate Kicking AIDS Out! training and concepts into existing programs and in return can expect curriculum and training support from the Secretariat, as well as license to use Kicking AIDS Out! branding. Network associates are non-governmental and/or other agencies working in the field of sport and/or community development. Associates should offer expertise, skills, and knowledge that can strengthen the network, and expect to gain license to use Kicking AIDS Out! branding.

Based on this structure, the Kicking AIDS Out! Network prefers to use the term organizational relationship instead of partnership. There are different initiation processes for each relationship type. Members and Associates must go through a lengthy
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79 TTASPE considers Kicking AIDS Out! Network a partner. As will be discussed, this difference in terminology has become an issue for the organizations.
application process and are ratified at a General Assembly. At this time, the Secretariat approaches all potential partners, with final approval granted by the existing partners. In all cases, Kicking AIDS Out! establishes a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

The Kicking AIDS Out! Network considers TTASPE to be a member of the network. As such, TTASPE has integrated Kicking AIDS Out! concepts and training into its programming. In fact, a considerable portion of TTASPE’s funding support is linked to delivering Kicking AIDS Out! licensed programs. At the time of the interviews, TTASPE was in the process of negotiating its supporting role for a Kicking AIDS Out! Network office in the Caribbean. The satellite office is a direct result of TTASPE’s feedback to the Kicking AIDS Out! Network. There was a tentative agreement for TTASPE to host a Caribbean Kicking AIDS Out! Network office, and both organizations were in the middle of negotiating what this step means financially and with respect to organizational autonomy. CGC IDS also was playing a major role in these discussions.

5.3.14. United Way Trinidad and Tobago

United Way Trinidad & Tobago (UWTT) is a national non-profit organization that mobilizes resources to serve NGOs and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) that deliver social services in Trinidad and Tobago. Its primary foci are fundraising and project funding. The majority of UWTT funding arrangements are one year, non-renewable (personal communication, 2010). UWTT officially uses the term partnership but is “committed to working with NGOs, government, business, labour, community leaders, and socially conscious individuals and organizations, locally and internationally” (UWTT, 2011).
UWTT is not a development organization, but acknowledges that it does engage in community development. In this context, development is understood as any activity or program that improves the quality of life for individuals or specific populations. Over the past five years, UWTT has funded a number of TTASPE projects. The bulk of the funding has gone towards hosting Jump-Rope sessions and regional fairs. In 2010, UWTT approached TTASPE with a three-year lease of operation on an estate property in Southern Trinidad. This offer was granted to TTASPE based on the scope of their work and TTASPE’s history of successful project delivery (personal communication, 2010).

5.3.15. University of Trinidad and Tobago (UTT)

UTT is an “entrepreneurial university designed to discover and develop entrepreneurs, commercialise research and development, and spawn companies for wealth generation and sustainable job creation” (UTT, 2012). Founded in 2004, UTT is supported by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, the private sector, and several international centres of excellence. In 2007, it opened the Academy for Sport and Leisure Studies (ASLS). The ASLS emphasizes this importance of fitness and health to students' achievement of academic excellence, as well as its emphasis on the development of sport as outlined in the National Sports Policy. Though ASLA has a department of sport for development, it does not have a working definition of development. However, the department does focus on three areas of development: personal, community, and UN Millennium Development Goals.

There are a number of official and unofficial links between ASLS and TTASPE. First, ASLA was established, in large part, due to the efforts of TTASPE’s president (personal communication, 2010). He was hired, independently of TTASPE operations, to
get the academic portion of ASLS running. Second, TTASPE’s vice-president is a lecturer in the diploma program and a Master’s student in its development-through-sport program. Third, UTT has an unofficial agreement with TTASPE to place work-term students. Fourth, TTASPE has contracted UTT to perform program evaluations and help develop monitoring and evaluation tools.

In this context, UTT has a mixture of personal and professional, official and unofficial relationships with TTASPE. As UTT states:

there are different areas of our partnership…some personal partnership….

We also use each other for our products, as well as services…. We help each other because we raise the profile of each other. I raise TTASPE’s programming profile by talking about them in academic circles…. When they are talking to program partners, they will talk about UTT as an academic institution that would help.

5.3.16. Summary

Table 6 provides a synopsis of the each organization’s main focus and partnership stance. In broad terms, nine of the fifteen partners focus specifically on development-through-sport (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15). The other six partners focus on child and youth education (6, 7, 8, 9, 10) or community development (14). Each organization has its own partnership stance, or description for its relationship with TTASPE.

Out of the 15 organizations, only one (6) had an official development definition. Of the remaining 14, one organization (13) had made a conscious decision not to have a definition. The remaining organizations had various unofficial understandings of
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80 Other TTASPE employees also are enrolled in various ASLS programs.
81 I took part in some of these activities while in the country.
development. In general, these understandings were based on notions of improvement and goal attainment and were framed by the UN Millennium Development Goals, or local demands. In most cases, development was defined by specific activities (i.e., outcomes and outputs). It was defined in more general or fundamental terms. This suggests, that for these organizations view development through an ethical rather than ontological, or moral ontological lens.

Of the fifteen organizations interviewed, ten of the organizations use the term partnership, four use the term stakeholder, and one emphasizes “working with” other groups. Of the ten organizations that use the term partnership, only one (5) has an official partnership definition, while five (2, 4, 5, 12, 13) make official distinctions between partnership types. Organizations that do differentiate between partnership types make distinctions based on geography, function, expectations, and economic role. There is, however, little or no inter-organizational consistency. The other four organizations (1, 3, 11, 15) use partnership, but offer neither an official partnership definition, nor any clear identification of partnership types.
Table 6: Organizational Focus and Partnership Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Partnership Stance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education, Development-through-sport</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Several unofficial types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development-through-sport</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official function-based differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development-through-sport</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development-through-sport, Sport Development</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official function, organization, and geographic based differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child’s Rights Development-through-sport</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official organization based differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Regional Standards</td>
<td>Official focus is cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Uses stakeholders and member states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education, Youth, Sport, Culture</td>
<td>Uses stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education, Youth, Sport, Culture</td>
<td>Uses stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Education, Physical Education</td>
<td>Uses stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Development-through-sport, Community Development</td>
<td>Use stakeholder or partnership depending on organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Development-through-sport, Physical Education</td>
<td>Uses partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No official definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two official function types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Development-through-sport | Use partnership, membership, and associate  
|   |                           | Official distinction based on network contribution and expectation  
|   |                           | Recognize the importance of personal relationships  
| 14 | Community Development    | Speaks of “working with”  
| 15 | Education, Development-  | Uses Partnership  
|   | through-sport, Sport      | No official definition  
|   | Development               |  

While a complete picture of partnership is yet to emerge, it is clear that none of these organizations can operate on its own. In working with parallel or complementary foci, these organizations rely on TTASPE, other organizations, and, at times, each other to find success. In working with others, each organization has a sense of what makes for a good or bad partnership. The next section explores these discussions and identifies a list of key these partnership characteristics or activities.

5.4. Partnership Characteristics

Over the course of each interview, interviewees were asked: a) how they define or what they look for in a good partnership; and b) how they define or what they look for as a sign of a bad partnership. These questions elicited thin and thick partnership descriptions.\textsuperscript{82} Analysis of these responses occurred in three phases. In phase one, the transcripts were read and re-read. In phase two, organizational data was coded as it appeared in the transcript (e.g., phrases such as “cooperation” and “need to work together” were considered distinct). In phase three, the partnership factors were grouped based on patterns of intent or topic. The results of this final phase are listed in Table 7.

\textsuperscript{82} “Uhm, Trust. Ahhh, understanding of limitations. Ahhh, clear goals, I think. Mutual respect” (TTASPE).

\textsuperscript{83} “So, it is very important, you know, to keep communication between us partners as the years go by. Constant relations. No matter what, night or day, always keep in touch with them. Letting them know what is going on and giving them a sense of interest, you know just keep us with them” (EADACS).
### Table 7: List of Partnership Characteristics and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Ability to alter delivery or procedural action in response to partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity</td>
<td>Level of inter-organizational coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Focus on what partnership adds to one’s aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Understanding of roles and responsibilities and external constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Quality and frequency of information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Ability to follow through on stated actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Relative autonomy of partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Perceived level of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Assessment of outcomes, processes, and interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Quality related to personal and non-contractual interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Signs of change in partner’s action as linked to direct or indirect knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Focus on supporting each other’s aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of partner differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Length of relationship with organization or individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Actions linked directly to funding distribution and program delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Organizational bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worth commenting on the order in which these characteristics are presented. Listing the characteristics in alphabetical order is intentional. In sifting through the data it became an impossible task to rank the characteristics based on notions of prevalence or significance. For example while TTASPE set the minimum partnership standard at length of commitment and shared values these factors were not universally shared. Different organizations had different understanding of time and the idea of ‘shared value’ was too vague to provide any real insight. Adopting a set essential, but non-ranked characteristics, fits well with the philosophic intent of this study. Philosophy has been well advised of the ethno-centric dangers of elemental ranking (e.g., Sen, 1999). What remains more important and relevant to this study is to map the parameter of the partnership’s moral ontology.

As there was a high level of convergence between organizations, the results of this analysis are presented in light of the partnership characteristics and not on a per organization basis, as in the previous section. Given the variety of quotes within each emergent partnership characteristic, only quotes that capture the intent of the characteristic or highlight a novel interpretation will be used in the discussion. Partnership characteristics are presented in alphabetical order.

5.4.1. Adaptability

Partners are always looking for a “best fit” with the other partner. Adaptability highlights the need for partners to alter their operations or expectations to facilitate comfortable inter-organizational activity. Adaptability can improve both program implementation and partnership quality.
CGC made specific references to changes in program implementation. They noted that while their organization has maintained the same mandate, it has used three different program delivery models in order to better meet the specific demands of different partners. Similarly, ASOP provided several examples of altering reporting procedures to meet the capacity of the reporting partner. From a slightly different perspective, Interviewee 1a spoke of the need to adapt to his partner’s reporting style:

And even with an organization like we’ve been able to build the relationship to a point where we still report and do everything, but it is not as hard and fast, as rigid, or as constraining to report to them.

TTASPE and Schools spoke about the quality of a partnership, suggesting that a good partnership is founded on their partner’s ability to adapt to local circumstances.

5.4.2. Affinity

Affinity refers to the level of coherence between partner organizations’ core values and motivation. The level of organizational affinity is found in the organization’s mission and vision statements, but is also evident in the organization’s day-to-day interactions.

It is in the day-to-day that partners get a true sense of their affinity. Often, partners espouse similar interests, but express the interests differently. For example, EDACS spoke about how a support means more than writing a check; it included spending time with their organization in order to find out who their organization was and participate in some of its activities.

Affinity is distinct from benefit. Organizations can benefit from the partnership (e.g., financial gain, reduced HIV/AIDS levels) without sharing core values or motivations (e.g., profit growth, re-election, service delivery). However, the quality of the
partnership improves with respect to the level of organizational affinity. For example, TTASPE tells of how one partnership was strained by a lack of affinity:

X came up with some ideas in terms of increasing their exposure…but for us, that will only happen unless they show more interest in the program. Or are more committed to the program mission than they are now…. So they need to show more interest in our work before we agree and say “yes.”

On the other hand, notes TTASPE,

[good] partnership is built around a common theme, and a common issue, and a common need. And that, in itself, brings the organizations together to see what ways they can be able to act towards developing or improving whatever cause they have taken.

5.4.3. Benefit

In all instances, the partnerships were established with an expectation of self-benefit. This is to say that, no organization enters into partnership in order to undermine its operations; all partnerships are thought to add value to the organization. Interviewees constantly stressed that partners needed to provide something of value. As TTASPE noted: “we seek to establish relationships on value. What value can you bring to the work that we do?”

84 “Is it possible to have a negative partnership? (Laughing) “I am sure that it is possible, though I don’t think you would intend it to be so” (TTASPE).
Benefit may be the most important partnership element. If both partners identify that the other has something to offer, they are more inclined to establish a common direction or line of support. This is reflected in CGC’s statements regarding finding pragmatic partners. Once CGC has established that a partner can provide timely and accurate program and financial reports (something they value), they are willing to continue to find common ground and extend the partnership. TTASPE’s partnership with the Ministry of Education is a good example of how the partnership benefit can outweigh any partnership inconvenience. Without the Ministry’s support, TTASPE would not have access to its target groups.

5.4.4. Clarity

Clarity refers to the level of understanding of both a) one’s own organizational objectives and capabilities and b) one’s partner’s organizational objectives and capabilities. As THA noted, for partners to be able to work together, they must understand: “Who is responsible for what? Who is responsible for who? Who can communicate with who? Who has the power to do certain things? And what do you not have the power to do?”

When entering into a partnership, each partner has an impression of who its organization is and what it can offer. This impression may not always be correct. As CARICOM states: “I tell you straight. Now most people don’t understand this. They think, ‘oh you have tons of money, then you can just go and begin to implement…. But that is not how it works!’ This sort of misunderstanding seems to be most common in
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85 Similar emphasis is seen in the Kicking AIDS Out! Network application process, which is designed to identify organizations that are not committed to its core values. ASOP also begins its partnership process by identifying what a prospective partner brings to the relationship, and THA will not work with partners who provide duplicate services.
the early stages of a partnership, but it can re-emerge due to personnel changes, or shifts in organizational operations such as geographic emphasis, type of program support, or financial re-structuring.

5.4.5. Communication

Communication, which was discussed in both positive and negative terms, refers to the official and unofficial exchange of information. Official communication includes written reports and evaluations, and scheduled conferences or updates. Unofficial communication covers all other interactions between organizations and personnel. Both forms of communication are important for different reasons. Official communication involves issues of clarity, transparency, and delivery. Unofficial communication involves equality, trust, and respect. Comments from EDACS acknowledge the different forms and functions of communication:

So it is very important, you know, to keep the communication between us and the partners as the years go by. Constant relations. No matter what, night or day, always keep in touch with them. Letting them know what is goin’ on and giving them a sense of interest, you know, just keeping us with them.

This statement refers to other factors related to communication. Distance plays a major role in establishing good communication; it is both geographical and cognitive. The availability of telecommunication and the Internet means that partners who are thousands of kilometers apart can maintain regular contact with each other. At the same time, TTASPE has noted that some of its communication challenges come from local partners (e.g., The Ministry of Education). Communication response time is also
important. The ability of each organization to operate effectively and efficiently quite often depends on information that a partner possesses. For this reason, it is important that communication requests are met in a timely fashion.

Changes in communication, distance, and frequency do not necessarily mean changes to the partnership. Though they can be signs of improvement or concern, they may also be indicators of activity fluctuation. At different stages, communication frequency will vary. This variation depends on program cycles (such as reporting periods), implementing new programs vs. maintaining programs, initiating partnership vs. maintaining partnership, or whether there are issues (positive or negative) to be addressed. As CARICOM indicates:

The relationship has not changed. The only thing is we don’t meet as often as we used to. And the reason for it? The work that I do at the CARICOM Secretariat has increased and their work has also. So we exchange e-mail, we exchange e-mail all the time. If there is an urgent matter I want to discuss, I pick up the phone and call.

Physical contact is also important for establishing good communication. Face-to-face interaction provides partners with an opportunity to feed off each other’s body language and energy. It also provides an opportunity to gage whether the oral and written communication accurately reflects what is happening. For example:

A typical challenge would be interpreting what they say they do, and aligning that with what is really being done…. Everybody lies to everybody else. And you know, exaggerates might be a better term, puts
the best spin possible on everything. And without having bodies on the ground, you know, visiting, it is very tough to make that call (CGC).

5.4.6. Delivery

Partnerships are built around some sort of action or service delivery. In fact, the most important partnership factor may be the partner’s ability to follow through on its commitments. The data suggests that what the partners agree to do is secondary to the partner’s ability to deliver on what is agreed. As CGC stated, “I guess overall, poor partnership can stem from unrealistic or unmet expectations on both sides.”

This statement identifies the two ways that delivery can falter: unrealistic targets and unmet expectations. Unrealistic targets are set when organizations either over-estimate their capacity or are unable to adjust their demands. Organizations are likely to over-estimate for a several reasons, including: eagerness to please the partner, competition for resources, lack of self-awareness, or over-confidence. An inability to adjust to partner demands is, not surprisingly, linked to power differentials between partners: an I say-you do partnership. More surprising, at least to some of the interviewees, is that pressures from other partners also drive the inflexibility. For example, CGC notes, “you’ve got these tangled political things going on in the background, which we are a part of, but not a part of…. There are all these political things going on behind the scene.”

---

86 “And so we started to build that relationship, you know, really based on delivery. And that is one of the strong underlying elements that have made us a ‘go to partner’…is delivery, that we delivery…no pretending.”
Though failure to deliver was often cited as the reason for allowing a partnership to lapse, this is not always the case.\textsuperscript{87} When possible, partners seemed eager to address and even renegotiate delivery objectives or deadlines that were set in good faith. Communication plays a major part here. Regular communication allows partners to continually monitor, support, and adjust delivery targets to meet the needs of both partners.

5.4.7. Dependence

It is expected that partners will have to depend on each other to some extent. All interviewees acknowledged that partnerships allowed their organizations to do more than they could on their own. Several interviewees spoke of “needing” or “relying” on their partners for expertise or support. The positive connotation of this factor will be addressed later as reciprocity. The negative connotation of this partnership factor is discussed as dependence. In line with dependency theory, partnership dependence acknowledges circumstances in which one partner is unable to assert its independence for fear of being unable to survive.

Negative partnership dependence was frequently linked to discussions about funding. Partners who offered funding were keenly aware of historic donor-recipient relationships, and sought to distance themselves, or downplay the significance of monetary contributions.\textsuperscript{88} Nevertheless, they were also aware that unless a partner were able to say “no,” then it would be difficult to completely overcome this imbalance. This

\textsuperscript{87} None of the interviewees spoke of terminating a partnership. Given the natural funding cycles, underperforming partnerships were simply not re-activated.

\textsuperscript{88} “…there is a two-way slope, but there is a power relationship there…. Now, I would like to think that my organization has never behaved that way…. It is never that black and white, but that is the more traditional way, you know.”
sort of dependence was also evident in TTASPE’s relationship with the government of Trinidad and Tobago. By law, the ministries have to grant permission before TTASPE can provide programs in schools. In order to gain this favour, TTASPE publicly supported a number of ministry initiatives that it did not agree with (i.e., photo-ops and short-term projects).

Interestingly, TTASPE has recognized the dangers of dependence and has made efforts to mitigate their impact. In regards to its partnership with the ministries, TTASPE has tried to leverage its support from principals in order to reduce the frequency of its pandering to ministry requests. From a funding perspective, TTASPE actively sources funds from several organizations. “No partner wants to feel the burden of an entire project all on its own, and it is not good for us to be so dependent,” noted TTASPE. In a good partnership, partners needs to be aware of the potential for dependence and make efforts to account for the level of influence or control that one partner has over the other.

5.4.8. Equality

None of the interviewees would deny that that there are important differences between them and their partners. However, it was important that in spite of these differences partners should see themselves as fundamentally equal. It is important that a partner’s voices are heard and opinions are valued. This type of essential equality is evident in the following interview excerpts

I feel as though I am part of [TTASPE]…. The relationship between we and TTASPE and the people in TTASPE, well yah, I don’t feel intimidated with them. I am on the same level, entirely. As well with the people in THA, same way. (EDACS)
[The Secretariat] has created that even ground…. We are the link between the members, the partners, and the associates. So everyone feels that they are operating from an equal ground. (KAO)

Perceived equality brings partners closer together and provides them with a sense of freedom in light of which they are willing to share both praise and criticism. As TTASPE stated, “We never ever, never put our selves in a position to let ourselves feel pressured by any of the partners we work with…that we had to cow-down to their demands. It is always say’n, this is what we do.” Conversely, when there is perceived inequality, the partnership dynamic changes. Feelings of resentment and suspicion arise. The working relationship between partners is strained: “My voice may not always be heard…. So for me, that was an experience that was kind of a revelation (nervous laughter). It has been very challenging” (TTASPE).

Partners rely on each other for funding and expertise. As a result, there is an inherent inequality. However, this type of inequality is different from the humanistic or democratic equality addressed here. Equality, in this instance, stems from the way in which partners broach their differences. “I think it is how you present, not only yourself,” stated TTASPE, “but how you would present what you would like to achieve, your ideals.”

Again, the emphasis is on perceived equality. There is a strong sentiment from funding partners that until their partners are financially self-sufficient, there are limits to the level of equality and associated freedom between partners.89 In short, the traditional

---

89 “Despite our assurance, constantly to the contrary, and I think we have shown a pretty good willingness to work them as much as we can, but I still think there is this ‘don’t bite the hand that feeds you’ attitude”. (CGC)
donor-recipient relationships, which implied inequality, still haunt the partnership ideal. Therefore, it is important that partners emphasize what they are both contributing to the partnership as a means of shifting the power differential towards, as UK Sport stated, “true equality.”

5.4.9. Evaluation

In each interview, conversation eventually turned to monitoring and evaluation. This turn was not always prompted. Regardless, it is evident that monitoring and evaluation are critical to partnership. In each case, partners spoke openly of official processes and tools for monitoring and evaluating partnerships. However, analysis indicates that accountability and program impact, and not the partnership itself, were the main evaluation foci.90

Official monitoring and evaluation was directed entirely towards demonstrating that the money was spent as it should be, that programs were delivered as agreed upon, and that the programs had a positive impact.91 In each instance, it is evident that funding partners drove this evaluation. As TTASPE states, “So we evaluate our impact…. Our evaluation with partners is meeting, they give us objectives. We meet the objectives. They say, ‘Nice! I like your report. We’ll fund you again’.” In this example, the funding partner determines whether a partnership is successful, and that success is measured with respect to delivery outcomes and not partner interactions.

90 “I know that you evaluate program impacts. Do you evaluate your partnership? I don’t think we have (laughter)…. Not formally, no.” (ASOP)
91 Several issues were raised here, such as uncertainty that what was being evaluated had a strong correlation with what was to be achieved, but these issues fall beyond the focus of this study.
Upon further questioning, the interviewees indicated that they constantly, and unofficially, monitored the quality of the partnership.\textsuperscript{92} When asked “What would you like to see change in your partnership with X?” or “Are these changes shared with your partner?” the answer was unequivocally “no.” In the case of ASOP, efforts are underway to establish an annual reflection process in which both partners could discuss partnership quality. However, it will be several years before ASOP and TTASPE engage in this process, as ASOP is beginning with its more established programs and partners.

5.4.10. Honesty

At the outset, partnership is filled with uncertainty, anticipation, and expectation. Partners have no first-hand knowledge or experience of each other. They come together based on word of mouth, necessity, or hope of benefit. Contracts and MOUs provide a certain level of assurance, but partners are just as concerned about establishing comfortable levels of honesty and trust between organizations and personal.\textsuperscript{93}

These two factors are particularly symbiotic. One partner assumes that the other is honest and extends a certain amount of trust to the partner, which if well founded, brings certainty to the assumed honesty, etc. Over time, honesty and trust can become more important to the partnership than the contractual arrangements; a point that ASOP made several times over the course of the interview:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{92} “No we don’t. Not formally…I can tell you off the cuff, I can evaluate the partners that we work with…. I can tell you off hand the partners I don’t really want to work with” (Partner).
\item \textsuperscript{93} “An ideal relationship, well, it comes down to—for me—a matter of being honest…. Things may not always be able to happen as soon as they happen, but once you are honest….” (TTASPE).
\end{itemize}
There is a strong financial responsibility and trust issue there…. You know, we have had instances where money has not gone astray, but has not been used for the kinds of things that we expect.

We had a consultant there for 12 months…. [Then] to actually go to a situation where our consultant was leaving…. [then] we had a discussion that we would like to invest in the organization…. For us, that is a gesture of trust, a gesture of belief in what they do.

Over time that level of trust has increased…. Take the early days of that relationship with TTASPE, that trust was there with Mark, and as time has gone on that trust relationship has gone up a level to the organization.

Levels of honesty and trust are also gauged through the levels of openness between partners, especially by partners who receive funding. For these organizations, the ability to be honest is linked to the ability to criticize, notes KAO: “we have been very critical because we have been very honest with them…. [t]hey are also critical too. They are very honest and critical, very.” Unsolicited sharing and advocacy are important too. When a partner is willing to provide benefit to the other beyond the scope of the MOU, these acts are translated into increased trust. Excerpts from TTASPE and CGC highlight this principle:

And if it is not an opportunity for us, then maybe somebody we know, some partner who can benefit from it. So that is how we deal with it.

They go above and beyond the call for being a host organization, and I often use them as a gauge for when I am assessing other host organizations.
Finally, partnerships can be sustained for a long period of time without a high level of honesty or trust. However, blatant dishonesty is continually cited as the only ground for terminating a partnership before its contract lapses. While none of the organizations interviewed has ever accused a partner of lying, most were able to point to a partnership that was not renewed due to suspicions of a hidden agenda or ulterior motives.  

5.4.11. Learning

Partnership is an evolving process. Partners look for and expect change in each other. More to the point, they look for and expect signs of personal and organizational adaptation based on their interactions. These changes are linked to learning. Three styles of learning are cited: 1) active expert-novice learning, in which partners are chosen specifically for the expertise that they have; 2) mutual learning, in which partners seek out common ground, complementary practices, or a better understanding of the other; and 3) reflective learning, in which partners transform their own operations based on field experience.

Expert-novice leaning is more than just filling knowledge gaps; it also includes a level of knowledge exchange. As TTASPE stated, “in a positive relationship, I look for someone that is willing to listen…a general support and also someone I can learn from.” In this context, knowledge transfer is not complete. Experts are expected to support the novice’s knowledge base and expand the novice’s skill set, but are not expected to transform the novice into an expert.

94 “I’ve seen partnerships, at an international level, fall apart, people feeling, and because I came from the NGO field, feeling that there was an ulterior motive behind the agency that we were allegedly partnering with. And you know, getting that colloquial “bad vibe” (Partner).
Mutual learning occurs when partners are seen to have equal but distinct knowledge bases, or when partners are trying to better understand each other. In the first instance, partners learn from each other, creating a shared body of knowledge. This shared body of knowledge typically is then used to develop a program or project. In the second instance, partners learn collaboratively or in parallel with one another or about one another. This form of learning is particularly important when establishing common terminology and shared understanding of concepts.

Reflective learning refers to the personal or organizational learning that results from partnership experiences. This learning may or may not be shared directly with a partner, but it is essential for organizational growth and development. As CGC noted, I think it [reflecting on experiences with partners] has helped us to develop as an organization. It has helped us to develop a higher level of thinking…. I think that we were pretty damn simplistic when we started…. So, I think [reflection] has helped us improve.

5.4.12. Reciprocity

Reciprocity, as mentioned earlier, is the positive form of the “needing” or “relying on” one’s partner. More specifically, it refers to instances where partners support each other’s aims or objectives. Each partner benefits from the exchange. Two types of reciprocity are identified: implicit and explicit.

---

95 “We might be sort of technically more advanced than others, but we certainly are not more advanced in terms of what children, youth, kids, young adults need in Zimbabwe or Swaziland. So there is a very distinct change there in terms of working with partners to jointly develop the programs” (CGC).

96 “Sometimes that can be kind of alien to them. So sometimes you have to take a few steps backwards, understand what is normal for them…and then build from that” (UK Sport).
Implicit reciprocity occurs when one partner supports the other, but is motivated by self-benefit. As CARICOM describes,

X is one of our best international partners, without a doubt. And why?

Because of all the things I mentioned. X does not only give you the funds for the work, X will sit with you and help you develop the program. They don’t tell you what to do. You tell them what it is you want for the region and [they] will help you develop it. That is partnership.

Taking a closer look at the partner organization, we find that supports mentioned are part the partner’s mandate. What the interviewee does not recognize is that her organization’s is also providing a benefit to its partner. For the interviewee, reciprocity is implicit.

With explicit reciprocity, both partners acknowledge how the other benefits from the relationship and are actively engaged in helping them attain the benefit. “You might be approaching them [the issues] from one way and they be approaching from another,” stated TTASPE, “but you realize that together you can achieve more, or as much, or your [mutual] achievement will be enhanced, complemented.”

5.4.13. Respect

An organization may not always fully understand or approve of everything that its partner does: “Although you are working as partners, you are not working from the same organization. So you have to be aware that partners have different objectives” (CGC). Therefore, it becomes important that these differences do not lead one partner to lose respect for the other. Respect is particularly important for addressing dependence issues.
Respect is quickly lost when a partner senses that it is no longer a part of the decision-making process; that its voice has not been heard or that its opinion does not matter.\textsuperscript{97}

5.4.14. Time

Time was mentioned as a factor in two main contexts. First, time was important in terms of follow-through and delivery. It was important that partners were able to provide quick response and meet expected timelines. Timely communication was linked to a sense of partner respect and equality. Time was also important in terms of how long the partnership had existed. Partnership was viewed as something that had to be built. The more time that partners were able to spend together, the stronger the partnership could be. As TTASPE noted,

When I first started working with X, I wouldn’t say we bumped heads, but it took some time to figure out how to work within their structure and to realize that this is their structure and appreciate it for what it is and try to get the best out of the structure.

There are two qualifications in assessing the impact of partnership longevity. First, partnership longevity is maximized when there is organizational and personal continuity. A long-term organizational partnership can be a frustrating experience when there is a high degree of personnel turnover. This is especially true when this turnover occurs with senior personnel or in a political context.\textsuperscript{98} A new organizational

\textsuperscript{97}“If there is any form of resistance from either side, I think, it is really difficult to make that exchange, partnership work. I think that this it is still going to be stuck in that donor-recipient level” (UK Sport).

\textsuperscript{98}“You know, we want to work with NGOs and in some countries in which we work the NGOs are pretty much creatures of government. And so, with changes in government we often get wholesale changes in NGOs. Something which shouldn’t occur but simply does…. You know, are we working with the same people that we made the agreement
environment can challenge strong personnel relationships.\textsuperscript{99} Second, only development-focused organizations mentioned the importance of long-term partnership.

5.4.15. **Transparency**

Transparency refers to more than organizational accountability (e.g., decision-making or finances); it also refers to the willingness of an organization to share information regarding its long-term plans and other partnerships. All of the organizations interviewed, especially those that provide partner funding, stressed the need to be able to account for how the money was spent. It was also important to demonstrate that programs were delivered as agreed upon. “Frankly,” noted one partner, “we will work with anyone who is doing the work and who is not going to run off with the money.”

Each interviewee was asked, “What changes would you like to see in your partner?” or “What do you find most challenging in working with your partner?” For the most part, the interviewee wanted to know more about a partner’s non-negotiated or external plans and objectives. To be clear, this was not an issue of honesty or trust. Partners did not feel that they were being deceived. Rather, it was a sense of not being totally forthcoming about issues that were not directly related to a particular contract.

Decision-making was identified, most frequently, as an area where this sort of transparency was critical.\textsuperscript{100} However, such openness is not always easy or desirable. It

\textsuperscript{99} “The challenge was that I…. There was a difficulty now that I was working for X, and I would to say: ‘now I am wearing X cap’…. I would make certain demands. That would sometimes cause conflict” (Partner).

\textsuperscript{100} “The challenge was that I…. There was a difficulty now that I was working for X, and I would to say: ‘now I am wearing X cap’…. I would make certain demands. That would sometimes cause conflict” (Partner).
can take time, even years, for this sort of partnership factor to change. In a political or competitive context, organizations may simply not be willing or able to offer 100% transparency:

There are things driving the X agenda that maybe we aren’t party to; that we don’t see, that we feel the impact of in terms of discussions on the ways things go…. There are limits, controls and what can we do? What’s the big picture that we are operating behind?…. There will be some times when, I guess like any relationship, there are things that you can’t tell someone for whatever reason. But as much as it is possible to let somebody broadly know the operating environment that we are operating in, the controls, the constitution, whatever…the better-off [the partnership is]. (ASOP)

5.4.16. Structures

Each organization has its own bureaucracy. In turn, each partnership creates its own joint bureaucracy. Establishing a shared bureaucracy can be a point of friction. This is especially true when there is a great deal of difference between pre-existing bureaucracies. Just how much friction exists is linked to the amount of time required to meet bureaucratic requirements, the perceived relevance of the requirements, and the expected benefit. Though bureaucracy is an accepted part of each partnership, it does

---

100 “If you’ve got no idea what is going on with them or their interest, then you can be manipulated before you realized, ‘oh, I’ve been played there’, and they’ve got what they need” (TTASPE).

101 “We have seen a lot of transparency and openness coming up after 2006. It took almost five, four or five years to reach there” (KAO).
affect the quality of the partnership. Common issues of concern include reporting, program delivery support, and financing.

Reporting is an onerous but essential part of partnership. Reporting serves two functions: it provides evidence of delivery for current partners, and it demonstrates capability to prospective partners. In this case, reporting was entirely up-stream (i.e., program deliverers report to program directors, who report to program funders, who report to funding sources).\textsuperscript{102} There is evidence that reporting procedures are adapted with respect to the capacity of the reporting organization; however, other concerns remain.

First, each partner organization has its own reporting procedure.\textsuperscript{103} Therefore, each new partnership requires more time spent on reporting, which leaves less time for program delivery.\textsuperscript{104} Second, the information contained in the reports is not necessarily directly relevant or beneficial to the reporting partner. In all cases, reports are based on up-stream directives. Combined with time restrictions, this means that reporting organizations do not spend a lot of time on self-reporting. “We should be do’in more self-reporting,” stated TTASPE, “you know, reflecting on what matters to us, but it’s hard to find the time. Because of funding demand, our partners come first.”

Bureaucratic restrictions or processes impact program delivery. This is true in terms of what types of program are offered, how they are offered, and when they are offered.

\textsuperscript{102} In all cases, the funding TTASPE received came from a secondary distribution point that was accountable to a primary distributor or overseer.
\textsuperscript{103} CGC and UK Sport have global agreements on reporting that allow delivery partners to submit one report for programs that are jointly supported. There was some mention of including ASOP in these agreements.
\textsuperscript{104} “Even the proposal for that project took almost a year from conception to the actual signing of the document and starting out” (UNICEF).
offered. This was evident in, but not restricted to, TTASPE’s partnership with ministries in the government of Trinidad and Tobago. As TTASPE states,

One of the challenges that is [being] so debilitating by the red tape and the bureaucracy that is created. It is government bureaucracy. But you see again with the bureaucracy, it is about purpose. The bureaucracy was created for a purpose, and I think that without an understanding of why certain things exist...they don’t know how to make things work.

Program financing is essentially a function of bureaucracy, and government bureaucracy in particular. Each funding partner has distinct funding application requirements, procedures, and limitations. This bureaucracy can be confusing for first-time partners. In cases of partnership renewal, the partners often work together to ensure that new applications are acceptable. As CGC states:

The process with X is that any organization can apply for funding. The funding is in a particular form and format. So we put in a proposal to do quite specific things…. So, there is negotiation with X during the [proposal] development stage of that. Where typically we would make a proposal. They would say, “no that doesn’t fit with out current objectives”…. You can’t do that--you know, we have interest in this area.

The complexity of the financial bureaucracy increases when the funds are traced from an original source (typically governments), through funding partners, and to funding recipients (program delivery organizations). From this perspective, understanding the

---

105 “For you to dump government funding into the program would change the entire dynamic of it because governments--it is hardly like governments would want to invest in a program like without wanting to control it, and use it for political means. And so we don’t use government funding in this program at all” (Partner).
funding agreement between a program delivery organization (e.g., TTASE) and its funding partner (e.g., ASOP) requires a closer look at factors such as: federal funding cycles, election cycles, foreign political interests, and regional political objectives. Importantly, the same factors play a role in establishing program delivery objectives and timelines.  

I think that part of the reason that we are in that situation is that we are a government organization…. So it is the nature of changing administration, responding to the international economic situation, that things aren’t as well defined, as perhaps, you would like them to be. (UK Sport)  

Finally, it is worth mentioning that not all bureaucracy is perceived as negative. In the case of Interviewee 13, the lengthy Kicking AIDS Out! Network partnership process has translated into increased concept acceptance and more productive and support membership, and has decreased tension between partners and members. Similarly, TTASPE stated that, “it is easier to work in a school environment than a community because a school environment already has a set structure.” Bureaucracy gives partners a place to fit into and saves them the effort of “trying to creates a structure in madness.”  

5.5. Summary  

This chapter provided an introduction to TTASPE and its key partners. The introduction included demographic information on each partner, a description of each partner’s focus, partnership links between TTASPE’s partners, and a summary of each partner’s understanding of development and partnership. The chapter also provided a

\[106\] Program funding was typically guaranteed for one or three years.
description of sixteen key partnership factors. This analysis is the building blocks for the classification phase, as presented in the next chapter.
6. CLASSIFICATION & EXPLANATION

[W]e don’t enter into an empty space…. We need to come together and see our particular need. So, our partnership is really based on leveraging the strength of each other. (Interviewee, 5)

This chapter addresses the final two phases of de Groot’s (1969) method of theory building: classification and explanation. The classification phase builds on the data analysis provided in the previous chapter. These characteristics allow partnerships to take on a variety of forms. They suggest that our quest to define “authentic” partnership (e.g., Fowler, 1998) has unnecessarily constricted our ability to validate partnership experiences. As noted in Chapter Two, any partnership study provides a list of normative partnership factors\(^{107}\), and this study is no exception. Identifying these factors is an important first step in establishing partnership. The next, and more challenging, step is for the partners to determine how these factors shape their identity. The following section combines the identified characteristics into partnership themes and the uses these themes to present a theoretical model for constructing development partnership identity.

6.1. Classification

The purpose of this study is to provide greater theoretical scrutiny of the development partnership experience. More specifically, the study aims to answer the question: who are development partners? Taylor (1989) argues that focusing on identity draws attention to the philosophical foundations (moral ontology) on which our daily

\(^{107}\) These factors can also be described as ontic properties, or the characteristics that feed into the larger ontological structure.
actions and interactions are based. Analysis of the interviews with TTASPE and its partners provided sixteen partnership characteristics.

6.1.1. Vocabulary

At first glance, the data analysis indicates that the term “partnership” was neither widely used nor universally defined on an official basis. Further probing suggests that partnership is more consistently used as a generic term that describes any positive, or intentionally positive, inter-organizational relationship. This broad view of partnership is consistent with Huijstee, Francken, and Leroy’s (2007) meta-analysis of partnership literature, which defines partnership as “collaborative arrangements in which actors from two or more spheres of society (state, market, and civil society) are involved in a nonhierarchical process, and through which these actors strive for a sustainability goal” (p.77). However, accepting a more generic definition of partnership contrasts with the more narrow definitions offered by “ideal” or “authentic” partnership (e.g., Fowler, 1999, Brinkerhoff, 2000).

This study concludes that partnership should be defined by broad relational intentions, expectations, and actions and not by idealized forms. Precedents for this type of approach are found in Aristotle’s treatise on friendship (*philia*). As Pakaluk (2005) points out, modern discussion of Aristotle’s friendship often suffer from an overly specific interpretations of the term. The term friendship was commonly used by ancient Greeks to cover a wide variety of positive social relationships. Accepting a broader understanding of partnership has three advantages. First, it allows an organization greater flexibility to establish their partnership identity. Second, it acknowledges that a good

---

108 See *The Nicomachean Ethics, Politics*, and *Eudemian Ethics*. 
partnership can take many different forms. Third, it encourages organizations to examine the nature of their partnerships, rather than assume that all partnerships are the same or feel jaded by the failure of their partnership to exhibit the qualities of an ideal form.

6.1.2. Identity

Tomlinson (2008) argues that identity involves placing the self in relation to the other; it is “the effects or outcomes of particular positioning acts” (p. 1004). The data indicates that organizational partnership involves three different types of identities: individual, organizational, and partnership. Individual identity refers to the identities of an organization’s personnel. Organizational identity refers to each organization as an autonomous agent. Partnership identity refers to the union between organizations.

Several of the interviewees mentioned that the individuals within the organizations often influenced organizational partnerships. TTASPE’s partnership with IAYS began with a chance meeting between the organizations’ presidents at a conference. The Kicking AIDS Out! Network indicated that in some cases it tried to build personal support for the network with politicians in hopes of garnering government support. However, it is important to recognize that individual identities can have a positive and negative influence on establishing and maintaining organizational partnerships (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Johnson & Wilson, 2006; Morse & McNamara, 2006; Reith, 2010; Tomlinson, 2008). The relationship between a senior government official in the Trinidad Ministry of Education and TTASPE is a good example of how partnerships can be hindered by personal conflict. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that any of TTASPE’s partnership were fully supported or jeopardized by personal relationships.
Organizational partnerships, notes Brinkerhoff (2002), are ultimately founded on organizational alignment.

Organizational identity is generally understood as “that which is distinctive and enduring in a particular organizations” (Brinkerhoff, 2002, p. 23). It includes an organization’s pre-existing commitments and actions, preferences, values, mandate, and bureaucracy. Understanding organizational identity allows an organization to position itself with respect to other organizations and provides a starting point for partnership discourse and action. This point was made by TTASPE’s executive on several occasions and supported by its partners. A large part of TTASPE’s success, both in program delivery and partnership formation, was attributed to the organization’s clearly formed identity.

Exploring organizational identity encourages an organization to question and clarify its core values and practices. However, having a strong organizational identity is not to be confused with organizational dogmatism. The data shows that TTASPE and several of its partners have altered the types of programs they deliver and their general approach to development work. For example, TTASPE expanded from delivering sport specific programs to broader community initiatives. Similarly, CGC has changed from delivering intern-driven programs to locally-driven programs supported by interns. In both cases, these changes were seen as consistent with the organization’s core values. They did not change who the organizations was. Whaites (1999) supports this finding. He makes a strong case the link between organizational success and the ability to re-evaluate and interpret organizational values and practices. His discussion of World Vision’s 40-}

---

109 This theme is primarily linked to mission, structure, and value partnership characteristics.
year history highlights how an organizational change from evangelism to partnership challenged World Vision’s organizational structure and outlook, but ultimately allowed World Vision to align its Christian values within current development sensitivities.

Having a strong organizational identity is important for establishing a strong partnership identity. TTASPE has partnered with several different types of organizations. Each of its partnerships shares common characteristics (e.g., dependence, respect, honesty). However, none of the partnerships is the same as any other. The difference between these partnerships is attributed to the unique identity of each partner organization. For example, TTASPE receives administrative support from ASOP, but provides administrative support to EDACSC. Again, TTASPE’s executives link its partnership success to TTASPE’s strong organizational identity. Being clear about who TTASPE is has allowed the organization to take an active role in forming its partnership identities. It has allowed TTASPE to make demands on its partners, and helped it to appreciate the impact of its partners’ demands. Take the partnership between TTASPE and the government of Trinidad and Tobago for example. TTASPE is aware that supporting government initiatives is important in order to gain access to schools in Trinidad and Tobago. At the same time, TTASPE does not support all of the government’s sport-for-development initiatives. Turning to its organizational identity for guidance, TTASPE feels that it has been successful in providing the government with the support that it needs without compromising TTASPE’s organizational identity. For this reason, TTASPE continues to view its partnership with the government as a positive.

Partnership identity emerges as the organizations form a working relationship. Most often, the MOU serves as the only official indication of partnership identity. The
MOU outlines the roles and expectations for each partner. However, partnership identity is also formed through day-to-day interactions. One TTASPE member spoke of ending a partnership when it became evident that the two organizations provided programs with compatible outcomes but from fundamentally different perspectives.

As discussed earlier, there is no one form of partnership identity. However, it is clear that the quality of this identity is affected by the interaction of the partnership characteristics *clarity, structure, and time*. Each organization has its own structure. As the partnership forms, the organizations must find a common ground. This may mean one organization adopts the structure of the other, as was the case between UNICEF and TTASPE. It could also mean establishing new structures, as was noted by CGC and ASOP in adapting reporting procedures to different contexts. In either case, this structural change does not necessarily change the overall structure of the individual organization, but it does represent a structure that is unique to the partnership. It is also important to establish clear partnership roles and responsibilities. The MOU serves as first attempt at accomplishing this. However, true clarity comes through day-to-day interaction. It is only when the partners begin to work together that they begin to appreciate what the elements of the MOU mean, and this process takes time. Subsequently, the longer and more frequent that partnership interactions are, the greater the understanding of shared identity

6.1.3. **Trust**

By all accounts, trust is an essential component of any partnership. “Development [partnership] has to be built on a foundation of trust. If there is not a foundation of trust, [then] I think it is difficult to have development partnership” (Interviewee 1f). Often,
though, it is difficult for partners to operationalize this construct. In this study, trust was mentioned as part of three partnership characteristics: *delivery*, *honesty*, and *transparency*. The quality of the partnership depends, almost exclusively, on partners’ ability to trust each other. Interestingly, no one area of trust is necessarily more important than another. An organization prefers that its partner be able to deliver what was promised, when it was promised. However, if the partner is not able to do this, honesty becomes important. It is better for an organization to be honest about what is happening than it is to try to appease or mislead its partner. Explaining why an organization is unable to deliver provides the partner with context. This context can frame this failure in a light other than mistrust. Failure to deliver could be linked to unrealistic expectation, poor initial assessment, or environmental pressures.

Transparency adds an extra dimension to trust. None of the interviewees expected that a partner should be transparent in all aspects of the partnership. “Like any relationship, there are things that you can’t tell someone for whatever reason” (Interviewee 3a). However, there is a direct link between the level of transparency between partners and the quality of the partnership. “But as much as it is possible to let someone broadly know the operating environment that we are operating in, the controls, the constitution…the better off [the partnership].” Increased transparency is not necessarily linked to better outcomes. For example, UWTT is not fully aware of all the organizations TTASPE has partnered with. This partnership is based on outcome delivery. Transparency issues are primarily linked to the long-term partnership quality.

As a final note, the concept of trust raises an interesting paradox for development partners. Trust is essential to partnership success. However, as Mcloughlin (2011) points
out, “trust may not necessarily be assumed at the beginning of the contract but may be built through interactions and communication, and over time, a more relational form of contracting, on the basis of mutual exchange and reciprocity may be formed” (p. 247). In short, it takes time to establish trust. Typically, development partnerships are based on short-term (one to five years) non-renewable cycles. How are partners expected to improve the level of trust between each other (something that takes time and commitment) when the relationship is only set to last a short period of time? Adding to the difficulty of building trust is, as Interviewee 2 states, the inherent reward for lying to partners. Everybody lies to everybody else. Funding is based on showing outcomes. If an organization does not show results, then the chances of its receiving funding are slim. Grass-roots organizations lie to international funders, who then lie to their national government, who then lie to the public. In such a system, where is the reward for promoting the most essential element of a partnership—trust?

6.1.4. Responsibility

Responsibilities are elements of the partnership that help to improve the quality of the relationship, but are not essential to partnership formation. Partnership does not exist without benefit, trust, and recognized rights. These essential components imply certain responsibilities. Moreover, these responsibilities are defined as moral, rather than contractual, obligations. The basis of this classification is found in the partnership characteristics: adaptability, communication, learning, and affinity.

Partners, especially in the early stages, are faced with a steep learning curve (Takahashi, 2006). At this time, both individuals and organizations are tasked with experiencing and interpreting the effects of the partnership. The partners have agreed to
certain things in principle (e.g., MOU), but it is difficult to fully appreciate what this agreement means. It is here that partners can experience a great deal of dissonance. The way in which this dissonance is mitigated is a reflection of the quality of partnership responsibility.

All the organizations in this study spoke to the value of having a partner that was able to learn about the cultural, contextual, and logistical constraints of the organization. Based on this learning, it was not expected that a partner would adapt its practices. However, adaptation was viewed as an important sign of solidarity. It was important that a partner change its practice due to respect for the organization rather than because it was a requirement of the partnership. For example, it was important for international partners to receive reports at regular intervals. Historically, these reports adopted a single style regardless of the partner organization. Currently, both the international organization and the partner organization spoke of how allowing situational flexibility in the reporting process improved the quality of the partnership. It was a sign that the partners took an interest in more than just outcomes.

This study suggests that the level of responsibility between organizations is more likely to be implicitly established based on personnel attributes. Few of the organizations had a specific policy or mandate that reflected the importance of partnership responsibility. These responsibilities were assumed to be a natural part of partnership. Vincent and Byrne (2006) warn against such assumptions. In their study of partnership learning, the authors call for an official acknowledgement of, and support for, learning spaces. While the quality of partnership responsibility may improve over time partners are better served if responsibilities are openly discussed and addressed.
One of the biggest challenges facing partners is establishing good lines of communication. As one Interviewee responded, “[it is difficult] interpreting what they say they do and aligning it with what is really being done.” TTASPE is partnered with a number of different organizations from various cultures and countries. TTASPE feels that it is important to differentiate between lack of trust in a partnership and miscommunication. Moreover, it takes time and patience to distinguishing between the two. However, TTASPE and several of its partners suggest that it is their responsibility to invest fostering mutual understanding. For example, Interviewee 3 states, “I think it is part of out role…managing the relationship…. A crucial part of our work [is] keeping them in the loop and letting them know what is happening and if there are changes with direction, clearly communicating why they are occurring.” Similarly Interviewee 6 notes that “sometimes you need to talk about these things because some people get the wrong impression about what is happening….”

A reoccurring trend within the elements of responsibility is that of diminishing investment. The idea of diminishing investment suggests that partners will have to invest a great deal of their resources in order to establish a good level of mutual responsibility. However, once a satisfactory level has been reached, the resource investment diminishes dramatically. In short, it is much easier to maintain a high quality of mutual responsibility than it is establish the same level mutual responsibility. “The relationship has not changed. The only thing [that has changed] is that we don’t meet as often as we used to” (Interviewee 6).

Finally, the level of organizational affinity between organizations can vary greatly between partnerships based on individual organization benefit and those based on shared
values and outcomes. Both levels can make for a good partnership, so long as the partners are clear on how much affinity is expected and how much exists. For example, one TTASPE interviewee spoke of ending a partnership when it became evident that TTASPE wanted a partner with a greater affinity for non-violent sport events.

The level of affinity between organizations correlates to the level of responsibility that partners have to each other. Partners who are more self-interested feel less obliged to put a great deal of energy into improving the quality of the relationship (as noted in the TTASPE’s partnership with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago). Partners who established a shared interest both expect a higher quality partnership and invest more effort in improving the quality (the partnership between TTASPE and ASOP is good example of long-term efforts to maintain a high quality partnership).

6.1.5. Rights

Partnership rights are a set of non-negotiable partnership characteristics. Unlike responsibilities, they do not affect the quality of the relationship. These are the elements that must be there in order for the partnership to be a partnership: benefit, choice, equality, and respect.

All of the participants acknowledged that partnership is a source of benefit. It provides added value to their organization. Interestingly, while partners accept that both organizations benefit from the partnership, emphasis is placed on individual benefit: I will stay in the partnership so long as I continue to benefit. It was assumed that partnership is not entirely altruistic. Each organization stood to gain something from the partnership. In fact, it is the ability to gain (e.g., money, expertise, access) that makes a potential partner attractive. Given that partnership involves a certain level of self-interest
it was important that partners have a choice of whether to be in the relationship and feel a sense of equality and respect between organizations.

Choice plays a unique role in development partnership in that it is both the primary coalescent force and the key constituent part. In short, without choice there is no partnership; choice is that which establishes the partnership and then defines it. Partnership begins with self-analysis and analysis of potential partners; yet a partnership is not formed until there is a mutual agreement, or choice for partnership. Strictly speaking, one cannot be forced into partnership (dependence). In this respect, it is completely unlike any previous development relationship (see Chapter Two), as partnership can only be entered into freely. Interviewees suggested that not all development partnerships are founded on choice. Nevertheless, while one might not prefer the potential consequences (e.g., financial instability, project failure), the choice still remains.

At the same time, a choice for partnership exposes partners to further questions or choices regarding how the partnership will function and to what end. As discussed, partnership has various iterations. What becomes clear is that each iteration signifies both a choice for partnership in general and a series of specific choices regarding day-to-day operations (clarity and communication).

---

110 Interviewee 2a noted that a choice between food or no food, or life and death, is really not a choice. Similarly, Interviewee 1a and 1b discussed that doing sport-for-development work meant you had to partner with certain organizations whether you wanted to or not.
The data also indicates that choice exists in both positive (choice to) and negative (choice not to) forms.\(^{111}\) Even here, as choices represent mutual agreement, partners expect a certain level of autonomy or influence in establishing how a partnership functions. Accordingly, partnership choices must take into account the final choice and the process through which the choice was made.

Equality is another important partnership right. This study identifies two forms of equality: existential equality and instrumental inequality. Existential equality refers to the fundamental connection between partners, organizations, and individuals. In so much as partners share in the same basic elements (i.e., both people, both organizations), they are essentially equal. Existential equality is the basis for Rawls (1971) theory of justice and underpins the right-based development approaches (e.g., Gready & Ensor, 2005). Choice, as a primary coalescent partnership force, also reflects this type of equality. Freedom to choose acknowledges the essential autonomy of an organization, and equality between partners. This type of equality can be extremely powerful. However, while partner organizations professed existential equality, partnership decisions were often based on levels of instrumental equality.

Instrumental equality refers to the comparative resource balance between organizations (See Table 5). It has already been recognized that part of what makes partnership attractive in the first place is resource imbalance. For this reason, the crucial questions for a partner are not what are the inequalities, but how much influence should particular inequalities carry? TTASPE has unparalleled access to Caribbean students and project leaders. UNICEF has financial resources and political clout. It is accepted,

\(^{111}\) In this respect, choice mirrors Sen’s (1999) call for development as the expansion of freedom.
somewhat begrudgingly, by TTASPE that financial investment can dictate measures of accountability.

Recognizing these two forms of equality is central to establishing a strong partnership, but it is only a start. Each partner enters into the partnership with its own understanding of acceptable behaviour with respect to existential equality and instrumental inequality. However, in partnership, these preconceptions must be partially suspended as partners negotiate a shared ethics. It is here that partnership faces its greatest challenge. Both forms of equality are equally important to partnership. However, while existential equality is openly acknowledged, the role of instrumental inequality is often downplayed or ignored. This does not suggest that partners do not recognize the inherent power of instrumental inequality (e.g., those with money can demand more). Rather, it implies that partners are hesitant to openly acknowledge and discuss (clarity, transparency) what this means for the partnership. In advocating for partnership as sign of equality, partners shy away from asking how are we different? and what does this mean?

From the outside, the implication of power imbalance due to instrumental inequality may not be apparent. In so much as partnership is directed by choice, it is possible that partners can choose to function in a way that affirms activity deference based on instrumental inequality (structure). For example, the local partner can direct program implementation strategies, or the funding partner can direct reporting schedules; what matters most in these scenarios is how the activity deference is established. In acknowledging existential equality, activity deference cannot be assumed or imposed. Partnership activities must be derived from a collaborative decision-making process, and
this process must be established in full disclosure of each partner’s pre-existing framework of equality.

Choice is also critical with respect to partnership termination. While it takes mutual agreement to enter into a partnership, a unilateral choice can end it. In theory, a partner can end the partnership at any time. However, the data suggests that in practice partnerships remain active for specified periods of time regardless of the quality. Most, if not all, development partnerships operate under a MOU. The MOU includes a statement regarding the length of the partnership.\textsuperscript{112} At the end of each partnership period, partners have an opportunity to reaffirm their choice for partnership, or part ways. This scheduled review is important for partnership accountability, but can also hinder the effectiveness of the partnership. For example, a short partnership cycle may encourage partners to focus on appeasing individual interests rather than working toward a shared benefit.

6.1.6. Evaluation

Data analysis indicates that evaluation is a critical element of development partnership. Partners evaluate their experience based on results and quality. Results-based evaluations are the most obvious and, perhaps, the most important to maintaining a partnership. As Macdonald and Chrip (2005) state, “[it is assumed] that partnership exists to perform specific tasks…. [P]artnership is task-oriented, prescriptive and heavily mechanistic, desperately anxious that tasks be accomplished” (p. 309). For the most part, so long as partners get what they expect, the partnership receives a positive evaluation. Furthermore, results evaluations are openly shared between partners. There is no

\textsuperscript{112} Typically, partnership periods are linked to funding cycles, which are set by external partners or government agencies. This creates interesting but unexplored loop between governments as representatives of the people and the people as target groups for development.
guessing if task expectations are met: partners know if reports were submitted or if programs were delivered.

The quality of the partnership is also important to partners. However, it seems that quality evaluations are more openly discussed in the literature than in practice (e.g., Brinkerhoff, 2002; Pickard, 2007; Fowler, 2000). None of the research participants admitted to either officially evaluating the quality of their partnerships or discussing the quality issues with their partners. In spite of calls for improved partnership (e)quality (e.g., de Schweintz, Anson, Manorty, Amuasi, Boakye, Crookston, & Alder (2009); Johnson & Wilson, 2006; Lister, 2000), it appears that “getting what you need” matters more than “how you get it” (e.g., Reith, 2010).

6.1.7. **Sustainability**

Sustainability presents an interesting challenge for partnerships. On one hand, partnerships are often tied to funding cycles and grant parameters. On the other, longer partnerships are important for improving the quality of the partnership. As Srinivasan and Collman (2005) note, one of the biggest concerns for community partnership “is sustaining the partnership beyond the funding period of the grant--especially if there is no financial support for the work” (p. 1816).

Changing identity is another factor affecting sustainability. As discussed earlier, partnerships are more likely to be sustained when partners exhibit a stable identity. However, one of the goals of partnership is often to alter aspects of an organization’s identity (i.e., capacity building). Capacity building “explicitly focuses on helping to develop the skills, systems, and capabilities that allow those groups or organizations targeted for assistance to help themselves” (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011, p. 6). If
the purpose of capacity building is to change organizational identity, this raises the question of whether partnership should be sustained?

The study data suggests that organizations see value in sustaining partnerships beyond a particular funding cycle or “built capacity”. However, in order for the partnership to be sustained, the dynamics of the relation will have to change. Having spent some time as partners, the organizations will have to re-evaluate their relative organizational and partnership identity. Given the restrictive mandate of some organizations (e.g., CGC), it may well be that broader development structures and approaches hinder sustainable partnerships. Davies (2002), for example, argues that partnerships for sustainable communities will have to shift from a model of deficit to one of transformation. In other words, sustainability objectives cannot be met if the primary motivation is deficit reduction.

Partnerships go through regular cycles of formation, activation, experience, and termination or reformation. These cycles occur organically in any partnership, but are more apt to be regulated in development partnership through an MOU. During these cycles, partners should reconsider the nature of their partnership and determine whether sustainability is desirable, and under what conditions.

6.1.8. Conclusion

The classification process identified seven key themes: Vocabulary, Identity, Trust, Responsibilities, Rights, Evaluation, and Sustainability. Similar themes are found in Brinkerhoff’s (2002) discussion of mutuality and identity. Borrowing from biological science, mutuality indicates dependence between two organizations that produces equal benefits for both parties. In a social context, Brinkerhoff extends this concept to include
“respective rights and responsibilities of each [partner] to the other” (p. 22). The idea of equal benefit offers a new dimension to traditional development relationship and challenge to development partnership.

6.2. **Explanation: A Theoretical Model of Identity and Development Partnership**

In this section, the previous themes are combined into a theoretical model of identity and development partnership. This model provides a four-phase life cycle for development partnership: 1) identification, 2) formation, 3) action, and 4) sustainability. The model does not provide answers to specific development partnership dilemmas. However, it does provide partners with a tool for assessing and advancing their partnership. This tool helps development stakeholders to define a space for discussing who they are as partners. Moreover, the model draws attention to the philosophic foundations of partnership and the essential link between partnership ontology (what partnership is) and partnership ethics (how partnership functions). The model is presented and discussed in successive phases.

**6.2.1. Phase One: Partner Identification**

Partnership is shared activity but it originates with individual organizations. For this reason, the first phase of partnership is one of self-reflection and potential partner speculation (see Figure 5:). The value of partnership is that it allows organizations to build on their strengths and support their weaknesses. The ability of partners to maximize this value depends on the accuracy of their pre-partnership analysis. This analysis focuses on three partnership themes: identity, rights, and responsibilities.
Figure 5: Phase 1, Identification

Analysis of self and potential partner:
- Identity
- Expected Rights
- Expected Responsibilities

Organizational Identity → Identification → Organizational Identity
The identification phase is a time for potential partners to clarify their personal and organizational identity. Before an organization can look to others for support or benefit, it must know needs. Knowing what is needed stems from understanding organizational identity. At inception, TTASPE did not identify itself as a sport-for-development organization. However, it had a clear mandate to use physical activity to engage youth in a positive personal and social experience. TTASPE also knew that it had good relationships with teachers but was unable to establish a positive relationship within the Ministry of Education. Therefore, its first partner (ASOP) was an organization that was able to help TTASPE build positive relationships with the ministry. Similarly, TTASPE’s executive had an accurate understanding of its personnel identities. This allowed the executive to make strategic choice with regards to which member took the lead on ministry related activities.

In this phase, it is also important to develop an understanding of the organizational identity and personal identities of prospective partners. Several of the interviewees commented on the importance of “know who you were partnering with”. At the most basic level, an organization needs to have a sense what organizations and individuals might have what they need. Beyond this, an organization also take note of organizations with whom they would like to work. For example, CGC extended a partnership offer to TTASPE because it knew that TTASPE had a reputation as credible organization.

Prospective partners must also give attention to the expected rights and responsibilities of partnership. Being a good partner requires knowing what you expect of partnership. This means looking beyond the language that organizations use and
exploring the actions that they take or the type of interaction they desire. Each organization operates in a context that is broader than any one partnership (see Figure 4:). Understanding how an organization operates in other contexts can provide insight in how the organization might operate in a particular partnership. For example, knowing that an organization does not have direct control over the funds that it distributes is important for setting realistic expectation regarding how adaptive the funding partner can be to the requests of receiving partner.

The identification phase is important because it allows prospective partners to form an idea about how they expect to benefit from the partnership. Furthermore, it encourages prospective partners to consider who they are individually, before they attempt to define who they are together. Ultimately, each organization will have to make a decision as to whether it would like to proceed with a partnership. An organization’s choice of partners can be limited by the type of work it does (e.g., school focused programs), its geographical reach (e.g., regional), the issue it is targeting (e.g., HIV & AIDS), the support it seeks (e.g., funding), the support it offers (e.g., program expertise), or the benefit it is pursuing (e.g., child-friendly space). The point of the identification phase is not to find a “perfect match”, but set the ground for a good partnership by increasing awareness of the limitations, possibilities, and expectations of a potential partnership.

### 6.2.2. Phase Two: Partnership Formation

Partnership formation builds on the information and understanding built during the ‘information phase’. The major focus of this phase is to shape a common understanding of organizational identities and establish a shared partnership identity.
This phase has two steps (see Figure 6). The first step is an invitation and choice to partner. This step recognizes essential partnership rights. The second step is to formalize the partnership identity. This step provides practical understanding of partnership rights and begins to outline partnership responsibilities.
Figure 6: Phase 2, Formation
The previous section draws attention to the fact that partnerships are not formed from a neutral position. Each organization comes to the partnership with its own preconceptions of whom a partner is, or will be. Based on the assumption of an agreeable arrangement one, or both, organization(s) extends an offer of partnership. As discussed previously, partnership signifies a specific type of relationship. From this perspective, an invitation to partner acknowledges a particular set of rights (i.e., benefit, choice, equality, and respect), or a fundamental understanding of what is being offered. By choosing to be partners, individual organizations begin to establish a sense of trust and commitment to a particular kind of relationship.

In order for a partnership to be a partnership the organizations have to do more than just say they are partners. The organizations must actually work towards becoming partners. This is captured in the partnership identity formation phase. It is important to acknowledge that partnership identity does not trump or erase the pre-existing organizational identity. TTASPE does not cease to be TTASPE simply because it partners with UNICEF. However, partnership identity can challenge an organization’s identity. Partnership allows organizations to add another layer of complexity to their identity. In this way, partners become more than who they were before the partnership. Their individual organizational identity is extended as a new partnership identity takes shape.

Typically, this entity is recognized through a MOU. However, the MOU tends to focus on delivery aspects of the partnership (e.g., money, reports, and time commitment). This narrow focus fails to capture the complexity of partnership. Remember, partners were also concerned with the quality of the relationship. At point in the partnership
cycle, the partners should give consideration to who they are. They need to have a
discussion regarding how basic partnership rights will be operationalized (e.g., what does
equality mean to us?). At the same time, organizations have real instrumental inequalities
and these inequalities have a real impact on the weight given to specific aspects of
negotiation. For example, while partners accept financial differences between
organizations, they may have differing views of how it is meaningful. One organization
may view financial stability as a negotiating advantage, while the other organization
acknowledges the difference without giving it any special value.\footnote{This difference of meaning was expressed from both a Western and non-Western
perspective. As funding agencies indicated, there is a struggle to have some partners
accept that financial difference did not have to indicate an imbalance in decision-making
power.}

Invariably, the way that these rights are expressed impacts the expected
partnership responsibilities. In the above example, the partner who views financial
disparity as conferring certain advantages may also come to expect disparity in decision-
making. Moreover, while such responsibilities often remain inferred, the model formally
acknowledges these responsibilities and encourages partners to address them from the
beginning. In short, a lack of initial clarity regarding the impact on instrumental
inequalities on partnership rights and responsibilities is bound to negatively impact
partnership success.

Partnership formation is complex, and often uncomfortable. Moreover, there are
three things that can mitigate this phase: the accuracy of pre-partnership information, the
level of inter-organizational trust, and the personal identities of, and relationships
between, members of the partnering organizations. As already discussed, the more that
partners know about each other, the better equipped they are to identify and anticipate
areas of affinity and conflict. However, when the partnership is new, the quality of this information can be questionable. For this reason, partnership formation requires a great deal of trust. Absent of first-hand experience, partners have to believe that what they are committing to is actually what will happen. The greater the level of trust, the greater confidence that partners have in discussing elements of the partnership that challenge existing organizational preferences. There is a direct correlation between the level of trust between partners and their openness (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). As one interview suggested, it was not until he felt it was safe to be himself, that he was able to have a frank discussion with a partner about the their relationship. This example draw attention to the final mediating factor: personal relationships.

Again, partnerships are not typically ended because of personal relationships. However, personal relationships play an important role in establishing partnerships. In the case of TTASPE and ASOP, the personal relationships pre-ceded the organizational partnership. In this case, individual respect was used as collateral for negotiating a partnership agreement. There was an underlying belief that personnel reflect the organization’s identity. This example is not meant to suggest that good personal relationships make for good organizational partnerships. Personal relationships, good or bad, can also hinder an open discussion of partnership identity. The point, however, is clear: these relationships influence this important partnership phase.

In this phase, the partnership is fairly theoretical. Organizations make a choice to partner and spend a limited about of time working out the nature of the partnership. This phase is short compared to the length of a typical partnership, but is critical in terms of facilitating partnership success. It is important that partners expand their formative
discussions beyond expected benefits, deliverables, and timelines. An open dialogue on who the partners are; one that strives to bring shared meaning to partnership rights and responsibilities, goes a long way towards shaping the action phase of partnership.

6.2.3. **Phase Three: Partnership Action**

The action phase of the partnership is typically the longest phase. It is here that partners gain first-hand experience to the theoretical partnership agreement. As partners gain experience with each other they are able to determine if the partnership is what they said it would be (i.e., if it is an authentic partnership). Partnership action includes the engagement in, and evaluation of: 1) the day-to-day partnership activity (i.e., working on or towards specific targets), and 2) the ability of partners to deliver (see Figure 7:).
Figure 7: Phase 3, Action

Engagement / Evaluation → Action

- Day-to-Day Interaction
- Reflection on Trust, Rights, Responsibilities
- Official Reports and Deliverables
The data indicates that there are two sides to partnership action: official and unofficial. Official actions refer directly to the partnership agreement as defined in the MOU. As the MOU typically focuses on the deliverables, official actions are typically those directly related to goods and services (e.g., transfer and expense of funds, program offerings, or reporting). Furthermore, evaluation of these actions is typically quantitative (i.e., was said good or service delivered on time?). This form of evaluation is open and transparent, meaning the partners share the results with each other.

Unofficial actions refer to the day-to-day interactions between partners. They may be directly related to delivery of goods and services, but are open to a much broader set of considerations. Evaluation of these actions is more qualitative (i.e., how organizations (or personnel) feel about the partnership?). For the most part, it is not openly shared or discussed between partners.

Both types of action are important in terms of partnership identity. It is only in action that organizations get true sense of who they are. These experiences bring a degree clarity that cannot be established through negotiation. Unfortunately, the current emphasis is primarily, if not solely, on deliverables. This is concerning. Provision of goods and services is essential to partnership, but as Aristotle warned, partnership based on utility are easily formed and easily broken. In this scenario, there is little investment in the organization that is doing the delivering. Furthermore, any number of organizations or relationships could deliver goods and services (e.g., Macdonald & Chrisp, 2002). Paternalistic development relationships, for example, also ensured

---

Questions regarding partnership evaluation tended towards a discussion of monitoring and evaluating program impacts. It was clear, that at least for now, sport for development partnerships are more concerned with proving program effectiveness than with the quality of the partnership.
Conclusion

delivery. Partnership is more than just delivery. It is concerned with how the deliverables are established and how they are pursued.

At the same time, only focusing on the quality of the partnership can be problematic. It is unwise to assume that a partnership is automatically more effective or efficient at delivering goods and services or achieving program outcomes. A truly successful partnership is one that has solid understanding of its identity (e.g., Mcloughlin, 2011). This means undertaking a balanced assessment of partnership actions (e.g., Killick, 2004). Therefore, partners must find ways to assess and acknowledge their day-to-day actions, as well as, their expected deliverables and outcomes. Harmony between these types of action is important in terms of establishing a complete and shared partnership identity. Furthermore, both are important factors in assessing partnership sustainability.

6.2.4. Phase Four: Partnership Sustainability

Partnership is cyclical. This is true so far as partners must continue to re-assert their choice to be partners. In development, the cyclical nature of partnership is formally expressed through termination and (re)negotiation of the partnership contract (i.e., MOU). The end of partnership contract provides partners with a relatively simple opportunity to discontinue their relationship. There is no real commitment to the partnership beyond the contract time line. However, if the organizations choose to reconsider their relationship, they are, in effect, making a judgment on the sustainability of the partnership. This judgment brings the organizations back to phase-one and the partnership cycle begins again (see Figure 8:).
Figure 8: Phase 4, Sustainability
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When organizations choose to sustain a partnership, they must be clear about what it is that they are trying to sustain. Dower (1988) argues that sustainable development is a matter of keeping that which is good and changing that which is not. In practice, what we consider good is relative to the context. Therefore, as the context changes so does our understanding of what is good (i.e., environmental change, political shifts, or increased capacity). It follows then, that as our notion of good changes so will our actions with respect to sustainability.

Partnerships are evolving relationships (Mcloughlin, 2011; Whaties, 1999). There are several factors that can affect the nature of the partnership relationship. Time is one of the factors that shape our perception of what is good. Building a good relationship, states Lasker, Wiess and Miller (2001), “is probably the most daunting and time consuming challenge partnerships faces” (p. 192). However, the short-term partnership-cycles are a major obstacle for partnership building. Short-term commitment adds a level of uncertainty, which makes it difficult for partners to move beyond delivery measurements (e.g., Pasteur & Scott-Villiers, 2006). Short-term partnership cycles encourage partners to renegotiate their partnership identity without allowing time for reflection on changes to their organizational or partnership identity. There is a tendency for partners to keep a particular relationship without asking if they should.

Guided by identity, partners should not look to sustain particular actions (e.g., funding, personnel, mentorship) but to sustain a particular kind of commitment. For example, when TTASPE first began working with CGC the relationship focused around interns. CGC needs to find organizations for its interns to work with and TTASPE could

---

115 Short-term funding cycles also limit the ability to meet development objectives.
use the personnel support. When CGC changed its structure, it was no longer able to provide interns. In other words, this relationship with TTASPE was not sustainable. However, the partnership between the organizations remained. CGC and TTASPE were still committed to sport-for-development and they were still committed to supporting each other. This commitment was sustained over a number of years, without formal agreements or day-to-day actions. Later, when CGC was able to re-invest in the region it turned to TTASPE and the organizations signed a new partnership agreement. By focusing on identity, rather than delivery, the organizations were able to sustain their partnership by allowing for changes in their relationship.

There is a tendency to think of sustainability as being synonymous with maintaining the status quo. This view is particularly limiting for partnership, especially when the partnership is task-oriented. Thinking of sustainability, as Dower (1988) does, in terms of change opens up a wider range of partnership possibilities. Rather than encourage partners to focus on maintaining the same relationship (and by extension the same identity) thinking of sustainability in terms of changes, encourages partners to explore different relationships. Sustainability as change allows for changes in identity. It prompts organizations to think more broadly about whether the partnership is truly beneficial and how or if it could be improved.

6.3. **Summary**

The literature on partnership is filled with lists of essential partnership characteristics. This chapter draws upon these lists to establish a broader context for the partnership characteristics that TTASPE it partners felt were most important. These contextualized characteristics where drawn together to establish broader partnership
themes: identity, rights, responsibilities, trust, evaluation, and sustainability. These themes were then organized into a partnership model. The model establishes four partnership phases: identification, formation, action, and sustainability. These phases lead to a cycle of partnership and partnership evaluation. Most importantly, the model draws attention to the importance and implications of identity in development partnership.

The final chapter presents a review of the study, and discussion of the contribution that the theoretical model makes to development partnership and the implications that the model has for development through sport practitioners.
7. SUMMARY & CONCLUSION: DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP AND IDENTITY

We don’t enter into an empty space… We come together and see our particular need. Our partnership is really based on leveraging the strength of each other (Interviewee, 5).

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary and general conclusion of the study. The first section provides a review of the purpose and rationale for the study. The following sections discuss the implications and possible applications of the model for development stakeholders, the delimitations of the study, and make suggestions for future research initiatives. A series of phase specific questions have been included as a starting point for model application.

7.1. Summary of the Study

Partnership is firmly established as the primary development relationship. It provides a development narrative that is broad enough to captivate neo-liberal and post-modern schools of thought. Partnership espouses development-based ethical dimensions such as equality, trust, respect, and accountability. However, at times, calling a development relationship a partnership seems more of an aspiration than a description. Currently, there is a growing chorus of development practitioners and academics who question both the reality and the possibility of partnership. The typical response from either group is to idealize partnership as a state of perfection or authenticity and criticize it for not being able to meet these expectations.

These responses point to a gap between partnership theory and practice. Identifying this gap is important. However, it is equally important to try and to bridge this
gap. One way to do so is through stronger theoretical scrutiny. Stronger theoretical scrutiny requires moving beyond lists of partnership characteristics to explore the philosophical principles of partnership and their potential implications. Following de Groot’s (1969) methodology of interpretive theory building, the study provides a philosophically grounded theoretical model of development partnership.

de Groot’s methodology outlines four distinct research phases: exploration, analysis, classification, and explanation. The first phase establishes the framework for the study and poses the research questions, which direct the subsequent phases. This study adopts Taylor’s (1989) philosophic understanding of identity as a framework for exploring development partnership. Taylor defines identity as the co-existence of ontology and ethics. Knowing who we are, he suggests, requires an exploration of the relationship between what we are and what we do. Therefore, this study explored the relationship between what partnership is and how it should function.

The question, “who are development partners?”, was pursued through a case study of TTASPE and its partners. The breadth of TTASPE’s partnerships, as well as the relative newness of its development approach (development-through-sport) made it an ideal partnership case. The case was built over a one-year period using a combination of participatory and decolonizing research methods. It became the primary data source for the final three research phases.

The second phase systematically compared the primary data sources. This comparison was done through several iterations of discourse-analysis and thematic structuring. Members of the case study group supported this phase. It resulted in a list of 15 partnership characteristics and four areas of resource exchange. The third research
phase organized these characteristics into six major constructs. In the final phase, these constructs were organized into a philosophically grounded model of development partnership.

The model provides directives for cultivating a broader understanding of partnership. Rather than idealize a particular partnership type, the model challenges partners to define their own partnership experiences. The model is not meant to simplify partnership, but to draw attention to the complexity and natural challenges of forming and maintaining a partnership. Most importantly, it directs partners to acknowledge and confront the ways in which partnership shapes and is shaped by identity.

The model demonstrates that partnership is neither static nor linear. It is a cyclical experience. Partners go through three phases: identification, formation, and activity. Transitioning through these phases presents partners with a choice regarding sustainability. If the partners choose to remain partners, they must re-engage each other from phase one of the partnership cycle. Furthermore, as each partnership cycle passes, it is expected that the organizational identities may change. Therefore, it is also expected that the partnership identity will change as well. This change can be in terms of quality (i.e., better or worse) or quantity (i.e., more or less exchanged). The most critical element of the model is that it draws attention to the essential connection between partnership and moral ontology as an important factor in closing the gap between theory and practice.

7.2. Contributions of the Study

The purpose of this study is to provide development stakeholders with a model of partnership that allows them to address the philosophical implications of partnership. Furthermore, the study intends to help bridge the gap between development theory and
practice. One of the main contributions of this study is its design of a model that expands the scope of essential philosophic considerations from an isolated account of ethics to the link between ontology and ethics. Linking ontology to ethics provides a more comprehensive foundation for establishing and nurturing development partnerships. It encourages development partners to consider how the way they act is influenced by who they are: personally, as an organization, and as a partner. This study confirms that development partnerships tend to focus more on partnership outcomes than on the nature of the partnership itself. The majority of the organizations included in this study, for example, used partnership language but did not define or evaluate partnership beyond the exchange and delivery of goods or services. Exploring partnership ontology and ethics allows partners to better appreciate the limitations, expectations, and implications of partnership.

A second contribution of this study is the highlighting of the importance of choice as an essential partnership right. Without choice, development partnership is not different from any previous development relationship. Without choice, there is no equality and there is no partnership. Choice has ontological importance throughout the partnership cycle: potential partners must be able to exercise choice regarding who they seek to partner with; prospective partners must be able to choose the terms of the partnership; and partners must be able to choose to sustain the partnership or not. Choice also has ethical importance. One of the key measures of partnership quality is how well partners feel that their voice, or choice for action, is received. A partner that does not feel that it has a choice in how the partnership functions, does not feel like a partner at all.
A third contribution of the study is its differentiation between existential equality and instrumental inequality. While organizations officially recognized partnership as a sign of basic equality, unofficially it was acknowledged that there were real differences between organizations and that these differences mattered. This model brings these two ways of understanding of equality to the surface. Acknowledging the different understandings of equality offers partners the opportunity to openly discuss the different ways in which equality influences the partnership. Predicated on mutual choice, partners have to decide how to move forward together. In turn, they are required to establish decision-making processes and criteria. Partners must acknowledge and account for influence of ontic properties (e.g., organizational structure or wealth) on ethical arrangements.

In summary, this study draws from development partnership experiences in a particular sport-for-development setting. However, the model represents an initial attempt to present a general model for understanding discrepancies between development partnership theory and practice and for creating stronger development partnerships through an expanded philosophic consideration of a key development partnership construct. It provides a theoretical approach to, and practical tool for, development partnership, where none is currently available.

7.3. Delimitations

This study was ambitious in nature. It results, however, must be placed within the appropriate context. Four key delimitations have been identified. First, TTASPE, by all accounts, presents a story of success. It partners are, for the most part, satisfied with TTASPE and their relationship. While TTASPE, nor its partners, shied away from
discussion negative aspects of their relationship, it is, perhaps, telling that none of the organizations that TTASPE’s acknowledged as having an ended or struggling partnerships with were willing to participate in the study. For this reason, the results offer little to no in-sight in to how identity factors into the unnatural demise of partnership.

Second, this model is based on a single sport-for-development experience. In spite of efforts to the contrary, sport-for-development remains on the fringe of more standard (i.e., economic, or social welfare) development approaches. Unless, sport-for-development is able to become a more central part of development efforts, these findings (or others of its kind) will continue to be marginalized, with respect to relevance, within the larger development partnership discussions. Related to this, these finding focus on single set of partnership experience. The question remains, how much can be inferred from a single case? Other studies confirm that key elements of this study (i.e., partnership characteristics, partnership themes) are found in other partnership experiences. However, it is quite likely that contextual difference may result in different characteristics or themes.

Third, closing the gap between theory and practice has proved difficult. This model does not provide a set of instruction for improving partnership characteristics, or creating successful partnerships. As such, it has prompted some to ask, so what? Dower (1989) argues that philosophy serves two purposed: to question and to answer. This model directs attention toward the former in hopes of the latter. It provides a road map, of sorts, for directing deeper exploration and analysis of development partnership. As a map, it points out different stops along the road from independent organizations to
partners and makes note of some potentially important factors. Similarly, as a map, it does not take organizations from independent to partnered. It is up to the organizations to undertake their own journey.

Fourth, the supporting literature on partnership used in this study draws heavily from practice-based social, political, and philosophical research. There is an established body of work in psychology related to social identity (Leary & Tangney, 2012) that could have implications for this study. Social identity theory explores various facets and linkages between individual, social and intergroup relations (Kramer, Leonardelli, & Livingstone, 2011). As Dashtipour (2012) states, “social identity theory is among one of the most influential theories of group process and group-induced change” (p. 1). The link to social change seems particularly relevant given the general aims of development and sport-for-development initiatives.

7.4. Implications and Future Research

The study presents a philosophically grounded theoretical model of development partnership. This model is more descriptive than prescriptive. It identifies a partnership as a four-phase cycle and provides key considerations for each step. Based on this model, what partnership is depends on who the partners are. This model does not lead to any specific type of development partnership. However, it does provide development stakeholders with a tool for exploring the moral and ontological limits of partnership.

Moving forward, this study provides several opportunities for future research. These research opportunities can help to strength the model, expand the connection between development partnership and philosophy, and bring improved clarity to development practice. One way this research can be expanded is by opening it to public
scrutiny. Along with sharing the results with TTASPE and its partners, there should be publications addressing the theoretical framework of this study, the identified partnership characteristics, and the final model. Another way to build on this research is to offer the model to organizations as means to establish new partnerships, better understand issues related to an existing partnership, or strengthen a renewed partnership. One possibility for achieving this is to use the model to develop a set of crucial guiding questions (see Table 8).
Table 8: Phase Specific Question

<p>| Identification | 1. What are the potential benefits to partnership for our organization and for other organizations? |
|               | 2. How is partnership different from other relationships we engage in? |
|               | 3. What are the differences between our organizations and others, and what do these mean to our organizations? |
|               | 4. What is the same between our organization and others, and what do these similarities mean to our organization? |
|               | 5. What does development mean to our organization and to other organizations? |
| Formation     | 1. What choices were made in extending an offer for partnership? |
|               | 2. How do we define partnership equality and development? |
|               | 3. What is our partnership focus? |
|               | 4. How are we equal and unequal, and what is expected based on our (in)equality? |
| Experience    | 1. What is important to the partnership? |
|               | 2. Do we share feedback on the partnership outcomes or processes? |
| Sustainability| 1. Has our organization, or our partner organization, changed since the partnership was formed? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Did the partnership bring us closer to our achieving potential benefit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Was the day-to-day partnership interaction positive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Will the partnership continue?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflecting on the delimitations of the study helps to identify areas for future research that may add to the scope and breadth of this model. First, research should be expanded to include failed partnerships. Hayhurst and Frisby (2010) analysis of partnership suggest that the natural tensions that emerge when forming partnership (e.g., those related to ethics and autonomy) may also lead to eventual partnership breakdown. In this respect, more study is needed to explore the role that these tension play in determining partnership success of failure.

Second, given the narrow scope of the study, future research should look to apply to model and test its foundational elements in other development and sport-for-development settings. This is important in terms of extending the validity of the model. It is also important in terms of bolstering the case for sport-for-development as having something important to contribute to the larger body of development research and theory.

Third, as mentioned earlier in this section, more work needs to be done to determine the ‘usefulness’ of this model. It fell beyond the scope of this study to try implementing this tool in a practical setting. However, this needs to be done and captured, with the results fed back into the model in order to determine if the model is able to achieve its intended purpose.

Fourth, the learnings from this study should be compared to other areas of identity and relationship theory. Schulenkorf (2010), provides an example of how social identity theory models can be adapted to understand the process of social change and identity formation in sport-for-development. It is possible that further research in this area could allow this model to provide a more prescriptive approach to partnership, allowing organizations to better align philosophy and action.
Finally, given the importance of time in establishing and maintain partnership it may be worth conducting a longitudinal study of partnership. In this study, organizations were asked to reflect on their experience with respect to changes in thought or practice related to their partnership. Following the organizations over a longer period of time would provide a better sense for how or if individual, organizational, or partnership identity showed signs of fundamental change or maturation.

7.5. Conclusion

In November 2011, I had the opportunity to present some of this research to a group of sport-for-development practitioners, several of whom were a part of this study. My presentation was generally well received, but it did raise a few criticisms. “So what” asked one conference delegate? Several of the delegates had come to the conference looking for solutions: how do we get more funding?; how do we ensure equality?; how do we build trust? This model did not seem to answer any of these things. At the time, I did not have any thoughtful response. The best I could offer was, “that is a good question. I will have to give it some more thought”.

So what? This study indicates that partnership is more complex than we openly admit. On the surface, partnership seems simple. All partners need to do is agree to a set of shared principles and deliver what is promised. However, most organizations realize, though not formally, that partnership is not that simple. This model suggests that the first step towards bridging the gap between partnership theory and practice is for development stakeholders to openly acknowledge a partnership’s complexity.

Moreover, the model draws attention to the philosophic implications of partnership. Partnership requires more than an espousing equality and shared benefit. It
requires deeper reflection on how these principles shape what we are. If organizations want to move beyond the ontology of donor-recipient relationships, then they have to cease to expect the same rights and responsibilities that are experienced through this relationship. As TTASPE’s partnerships exhibited, successful partnerships begin with a strong sense of organizational identity and a commitment to working through the challenges and changes involved in working together.

Partnership does not guarantee anything that is meaningfully generalized. Its reward, and challenge, is always specific. For this reason, it is naive to expect this, or any, partnership model to provide answers. Therefore, the value of this model is not just found in the answers that it provides, but also in the question that it addresses: who are we as partners?
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Appendix B: Research Question Guide

0 Background
   What is your name?
   With which organization/group do you work/volunteer?
   Describe your organization.
   How long have you been a part of this organization/group?
   What position(s) do you/ have you held during this time?

1 Who are (development) partners?
   Development.
      What does it mean?
      What is its purpose or goals?
      Why is it important?
      With how many organizations are you partnered?
   Partnership.
      What does it mean?
      What is its purpose or goal?
      Why is it important?
      How is it different from other relationships?
   Development partnership.
      What does it mean?
      What is its purpose or goal?
      Why is it important?
      Is it different from other development relationships or partnerships?

2 What are the normative elements and instrumental functions of partnership?
   Describe your relationship with ____.
      Why was it formed?
      How was it formed?
      When did the partnership begin?
      What is your role or responsibility?
      What is ____’s role or responsibility?
      How are decisions made?
      How are issues raised?
      How is your partnership evaluated?
      What might cause the partnership to end?
      How much time do you invest in the partnership?
      How much time does ____ invest in the partnership?
      Has your partnership changed? How?
Interview Questions continued…

3 How do these elements and functions manifest themselves in practice?
   Describe a positive issue(s) that you had with ____.
   How was/were this issue(s) handled?
   What was/were the outcome(s)?
   How did this affect your partnership?
Describe a negative issue(s) that you had with ____.
   How was/were this issue(s) handled?
   What was/were the outcome(s)?
   How did this affect your partnership?
Earlier, you described a development partnership as________.
   How does what happened with these issues fit with this description?
   How might the issues have been resolved based on your description?
   Does this description match your current partnership with ______?
Based on this description, is there anything that you would like to change regarding your current partnership? Why?
# Appendix D: Sport-For-Development Links to the Millennium Development Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>Sport Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger     | • Participants, volunteers and coaches acquire transferable life skills that increase their employability  
                                           • Vulnerable individuals are connected to community services and supports through sport-based outreach programs  
                                           • Sport programs and sport equipment production provide jobs and skills development  
                                           • Sport can help prevent diseases that impede people from working and impose healthcare costs on individuals and communities  
                                           • Sport can help reduce stigma and increase self-esteem, self-confidence, and social skills, leading to increased employability |
| Achieve Universal Primary Education      | • School sport programs motivate children to enroll in and attend school and can help improve academic achievement  
                                           • Sport-based community education programs provide alternative education opportunities for children who cannot attend school  
                                           • Sport can help erode stigma preventing children with disabilities from attending school |
| Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women| • Sport helps improve female physical and mental health and offers opportunities for social interaction and friendship  
                                           • Sport participation leads to increased self-esteem, self-confidence, and enhanced sense of control over one’s body  
                                           • Girls and women access leadership opportunities and experience  
                                           • Sport can cause positive shifts in gender norms that afford girls and women greater safety and control over their lives  
                                           • Women and girls with disabilities are empowered by sport-based opportunities to acquire health information, skills, social networks, and leadership experience |
| Reduce Child Mortality                   | • Sport can be used to educate and deliver health information to young mothers, resulting in healthier children  
                                           • Increased physical fitness improves children’s resistance to some diseases  
                                           • Sport can help reduce the rate of higher-risk adolescent pregnancies  
                                           • Sport-based vaccination and prevention campaigns help reduce child deaths and disability from measles, malaria and polio  
                                           • Inclusive sport programs help lower the likelihood of infanticide by promoting greater acceptance of children with disabilities |
| Improve Maternal Health                  | • Sport for health programs offer girls and women greater access to reproductive health information and services  
                                           • Increased fitness levels help speed post-natal recovery |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combat HIV and AIDS, Malaria and other Diseases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sport programs can be used to reduce stigma and increase social and economic integration of people living with HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sport programs are associated with lower rates of health risk behaviour that contributes to HIV infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs providing HIV prevention education and empowerment can further reduce HIV infection rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sport can be used to increase measles, polio and other vaccination rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement of celebrity athletes and use of mass sport events can increase reach and impact of malaria, tuberculosis and other education and prevention campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure Environmental Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sport-based public education campaigns can raise awareness of importance of environmental protection and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sport-based social mobilization initiatives can enhance participation in community action to improve local environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop a Global Partnership for Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sport for Development and Peace efforts catalyze global partnerships and increase networking among governments, donors, NGOs and sport organizations worldwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
<th>Potential Persons Interviewed</th>
<th>Actual Persons Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TTASPE*</td>
<td>NP-NGO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commonwealth Games Canada*</td>
<td>NP-NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Australian Sport Commission*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UK Sport*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UNICEF*</td>
<td>NP-INGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CARICOM*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OCASPE*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Government of Trinidad and Tobago*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tobago House of Assembly*</td>
<td>GO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Schools*</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Community Organizations*</td>
<td>NP-NGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. International Alliance for Youth Sport *</td>
<td>FP-NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kicking AIDS Out Network*</td>
<td>NP-INGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. United Way Trinidad and Tobago*</td>
<td>NP-NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Trinidad and Tobago*</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geo-Political Structure:</th>
<th></th>
<th>* International</th>
<th>* Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP – For Profit</td>
<td>GO – Government Organization</td>
<td>* National</td>
<td>* Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP – Non-profit</td>
<td>NGO – Non-Governmental Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS – Public Service</td>
<td>INGO – International Non-governmental Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix F: Interviewee Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Length of Organization Partnership</th>
<th>Length of Employment</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>President, Vice-President, Sport Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager of International Programs, International Internship Coordinator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor to CGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Sport Outreach Program Sport Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Manger, Assistant Manager International Relations for Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>International Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Program Manager for Human Resources Development Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>England Trinidad and</td>
<td>International Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tobago</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Officer Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Program Manager for Human Resources Development Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Ministry of Youth and Sport, Minister of Education, Regional Sport and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Officer Two, Sport Officer One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Lucia Trinidad and</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Regional Sport and Sport Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tobago</td>
<td>Two, Sport Officer One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Primary School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tobago</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Regional Sport and Sport Officer One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Regional Sport and Sport Officer One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tobago</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Regional Sport and Sport Officer One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO, International Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Training and Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>NGO Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Academy of Sport and Leisure Studies Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Academy of Sport and Leisure Studies Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Years of existence and years of employment

<sup>2</sup> Interviewee worked for TTASPE prior to UNICEF position
## Appendix G: Organization Resource Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Program Material</td>
<td>Equipment Sourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Material</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Policy Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Delivery</td>
<td>Delivery Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment Sourcing</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Delivery Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Policy Support</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Sourcing</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Access</td>
<td>Evaluation Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Access</td>
<td>Evaluation Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>