

https://dspace.org/

# The relationship between Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), in implementing development projects in Mozambique.

**Chilengue, Nárcya Da Piedade A. M.**

**2014-02-18**
http://hdl.handle.net10539/13844

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

# The Relationship between Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), in implementing Development projects in Mozambique.

**A report on a research project presented to**

**The Discipline of Sociology**

**School of Social Sciences**

**Faculty of Humanities**

**University of the Witwatersrand**

**In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts (Development Studies) by Coursework and Research Report**

**By**

**Nárcya Da Piedade A. M. Chilengue**

**Student No: 538584**

**Supervisor: Prof. Ran Greenstein**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents ..... i
DECLARATION ..... iii
Dedicated: ..... iv
List of Abbreviations ..... v
Acknowledgement ..... vi
Abstract ..... vii
Chapter 1: Introduction ..... 1
1.1 Research Topic ..... 1
1.2 Introduction ..... 1
1.2.1 Non-Governmental Organisation and Community-Based Organisations ..... 4
1.3 Background ..... 6
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework ..... 10
2.1 Literature review ..... 10
2.1.1 Neoliberalism and the emergence of civil society in developing countries ..... 10
2.1.2 Partnership and Aid Relation within Social Development Projects ..... 11
2.1.3 Theoretical Framework ..... 17
Chapter 3: Methodology and Ethical appraisal ..... 22
3.1. Methodology ..... 22
3.1.1 Sampling ..... 23
3.1.2 Data collection methods ..... 23
3.1.3 Methodological experience ..... 25
3.2 Ethical appraisal ..... 26
Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis ..... 27
4.1 Characteristics of the NGOs and CBOs ..... 27
4.2 Types of Partnerships between NGOs and CBOs ..... 29
4.3 Decision-Making Process: The process of identification of partners and establishment of partnership ..... 30
4.3.1 The process of identification of partners ..... 30
4.3.2 Establishment of partnership ..... 31
4.3.3 The influence of the Donors in the partnership between NGOs and CBOs ..... 36
4.3.4 The process of project design and activities implementation ..... 37
4.4 Roles and Responsibilities within the partnership ..... 41
4.4.1 Analysing Discourses behind the NGOs and CBOs understanding of their Roles and Responsibilities ..... 41
4.4.2 Strategies of Power, Control, Resistance and Counter-Power ..... 43
4.5 Interaction between NGOs and CBOs within the partnership ..... 46
4.5.1 Significance of partnership ..... 46
4.5.2 Significance of partnership: Benefits and gains ..... 47
4.5.3 The Relation between Risk and incentives within the partnership between NGOs and CBOs ..... 49
4.5.4 Points of disagreements and potential conflicts ..... 52
Chapter 5: Conclusions ..... 54
Bibliography ..... 56
Appendixes ..... 60
Ethics Information Sheet ..... 61
Permission Form ..... 62
Permission form for Recording ..... 63

Consent form for Recording ..... 64
Interview Schedule for NGOs ..... 65
Interview Schedule for CBOs ..... 68

**DECLARATION**

I, Nárcya Da Piedade Aniceto Manjate Chilengue declare that this research report is my unaided work. It is submitted as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (Development Studies) by Coursework and Research Report at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted for any other degree or examination at any other University.

Signed: Nárcya Chilengue Date: 10/ 03 / 2013

Dedicated:

***To my children Nick and Gerson, and my husband Inácio***

## List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| AAMOZ | Action Aid Mozambique |
| AJN | Nacala - Port Youth Association |
| CBO | Community-Based Organization |
| CSG | Child Social Grant |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| FDC | Foundation for Community Development |
| FRELIMO | Front of the Liberation of Mozambique |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| HIV/SIDA | Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome |
| HRBA | Human Rights Based approach |
| IFM | International Monetary Fund |
| NGO | Non-Government Organization |
| NNGO | Northern Non-Government Organisation |
| OVCs | Orphans and Vulnerable Children |
| PRA | Participatory Rural Appraisal |
| RENAMO | Mozambican National Resistance |
| SAPs | Structural Adjustment Programs |
| SNGO | Southern Non-Government Organisation |
| WB | The World Bank |

**Acknowledgement**

It has been a long, tortuous, and difficult journey, but thanks to the support of a number of people I managed to get here and write the present research report. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Ran Greenstein for his guidance throughout the process of this research. I would also like to thank Prof. Michelle Williams for all her support from the embryonic stage of the project; to Dr. Stephen Lown, who made valuable considerations to my proposal which gave rise to this research report. Thank you all for everything!

I would also like to address a special thank you to the organisations that participated in this research (Reencontro, Ntwanano, Nyvenyee, Youth Association of Nacala- AJN, ActionAid and the Foundation for Community Development- FDC) and especially to the people who were interviewed. Special thanks go to Mr. Aboobakar Covela from ActionAid, for sharing his experiences with me and for facilitating much of my work during the data collection phase.

To my husband Inácio Chilengue, and children Nicole and Gerson, I would like to thank you very much for being so patient during my absence from home. I also want to thank my husband for his financial, material and moral support and for sharing with me his experiences of working with NGOs and CBOs. To my parents Celeste Jalane and Aniceto Manjate, my brothers Alberto, Armando, Vicente, and sister Paula, thanks for your unconditional support and words of encouragement.

To my friends Laura Simão, Elsa and Luis Chuquela for helping me with all the administrative processes and encouragement when it was still a dream. I also thank Grace and Maarten, for having accommodated me in their house during my studies. To my friends and classmates, Delphine and Faith for your company, for sharing your experiences with me and for the time we spent together. A special thank you goes to my editor, Mr. Graham Bailey to whom I owe so much. For his editing skill, suggestions, discussions and criticism, that helped me to get here.

I owe each of you in a very particular way! Khanimambo!

**Abstract**

This study describes and reflects on the partnership between Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) in implementing development projects in Mozambique. This is a qualitative case study, whose methods of data collection were in-depth semi-structured interviews and document analysis. The study was conducted with two NGOs (one international and one national) and with four CBOs and it took place in Nampula and Gaza provinces and the capital Maputo. The data were analyzed using quantitative method.

NGOs and CBOs are different entities in terms of their levels of actuation, responsibilities, nature, and also differ in terms of resources, such as access to information, funding sources and human resources. These differences have raised questions around the possibility of the establishment of an equitable and properly functioning partnership between entities that differ so much in nature.

The NGOs depend majorly on external funds to support the CBOs; however they also rely on their own funds or funds made available by local funders' institutions. Equally, the CBOs also undertake, some income activity generation, whose income is used for their own institutional expenses and also to support some community needs, though they rely mostly on funds provided by the NGOs.

The central idea of this study is that despite the differences between NGOs and CBOs they can establish a balanced partnership based on the recognition of the contribution of each partner and on the significance both attribute to the partnership. The differences constitute the basis of the partnership which in turn allows the acquisition of mutual benefits, recognition and sharing of power.

In terms of theoretical framework, I have used Agency theory wherein the NGO is the "Principal" which in a relationship governed by a contract delegates the CBOs as the "Agent" of the implementation of projects in the communities.

The results showed that the partnership between NGOs and CBOs is characterised by complementarities, mutual benefits, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both. The partnership is also based on recognition of the weaknesses, strengths and value of each partner which give place to a balanced partnership. However being a balanced partnership it is also characterised by conflicts that result from the difference of interest between NGOs and CBOs. Risk constitutes another element that characterizes this partnership since the NGOs delegate the CBOs the implementation of the project and not always the CBOs will perform as it is advocated in the contract. Though, as the partnership is valuable for both, NGOs and CBOs will engage in developing strategies for minimising the potential risk in order to maintain and maximise the partnership.

The data also showed that the locus of conflict and risk are essentially linked to misusage of money. Since the CBOs implement the project and are institutionally independent from the NGOs, the NGOs develop some strategies of control to ensure that the CBOs will act in accordance of what the contract advocates. It is within these strategies wherein the conflict arises, especially because the CBOs do not always understand some of the strategies adopted by NGOs to ensure the accomplishment of the contract what led the CBOs also to adopt some strategies of resistance.

In terms of power and decision-making the data showed that both exercise different kind of power and the CBOs influence the decision-making process, though the NGOs showed to have greater control over the process.

The contribution of this study to the existing literature lies in the fact that it brings a different approach to the power relations between NGOs and CBOs, which is usually seen as a relationship of the exercise of power by the NGOs over the CBOs. The study seeks to show that the strategies of resistance, counter power and negotiation developed by the CBOs constitute a different form of exercise of power and influence. It also shows that the CBOs are not passive actors in the partnership because they develop strategies to influence and attract the NGOs in the establishment of partnership and decision-making throughout the project cycle.

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## 1.1 Research Topic

The relationship between Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), in implementing development projects in Mozambique.

## 1.2 Introduction

This study is a reflection and description of the nature of the partnership between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects. The NGOs are analysed as the entities which provide funds and technical support to the CBOs, which in their turn implement social development projects in the communities. More specifically, it constitutes an analysis and description of the mechanisms which inform and shape the partnerships between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects in Mozambique, focusing on the power relations and decision-making process within the partnership.

This is a qualitative case study, and was carried out with 2 (two) NGOs, one international[1] - ActionAid Mozambique (AAMOZ) and one national- Foundation For community development- FDC, and with (four) 4 CBOs, namely: Nacala-Port Youth Association (AJN), Nivenyee, Ntwanano and Reencontro in Nampula and Gaza provinces and the capital Maputo. The data were collected using in-depth semi-structured interviews and document analysis and were analysed using qualitative methods.

In general, the study aims to reflect on the nature of partnership between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects. And, specifically it aims:

- To identify the elements that constitute the basis for the partnership;

[1] AAMOZ is a Mozambican organisation since 2012. When I started the study in February 2012, it was still an International NGO. Nevertheless it is still part of ActionAid International.

- To describe the interaction between CBOs and NGOs;
- To analyse the perceptions of the NGOs and CBOs about the significance of the partnerships established between and to each other;
- To reflect on power relations and decision-making process within the partnership between NGOs and CBOs;
- To identify the strategies used by CBOs and NGOs to maximise and maintain the partnerships.

The study will be oriented by the following research question: *What is the nature of the partnership between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects in Mozambique?*

With this question I seek to explore the following aspects:

- How NGOs and CBOs understand their own roles, contributions and responsibilities within the partnership?
- What informs the decision-making process within the partnership (project design, activities implementation, establishment of partnership)?
- What is the significance of the partnership NGOs and CBOs?
- What are the points of complement, disagreements and connection between NGOs and CBOs?

There are many studies in the area of international aid relations, however most of them focus on the relationship between Northern Non-Government Organisations (NNGOs) and Southern Non-Government Organisations (SNGOs) or[2] between international NGOs and local NGOs and the partnership between them is analysed in terms of its functionality in creating sustainability or straightening SNGOs capacity. In doing so, the studies point out the predominance of unequal and asymmetric relationships, characterised by the exercise of power by Northern NGOs.

[2] It depends on the terminology used, but specifically in Mozambique it is common the use of international and local NGOs.

Particularly, in Mozambique a considerable number of studies[3] which addresses the relationships between NGOs are also based on the function of the partnership, seen as a means to strengthen local civil society through provision of capacity building and funding. It is considered that the partnership between international NGOs and local NGOs is not helping in strengthening local NGOs and local NGOs have no power and role in decision-making process and merely act in accordance to the desires of international NGOs.

In my point of view this is a reductionist approach by the fact that it understands power only at its institutional level, and ignores other strategies and forms of power that the local NGOs or CBOs can appeal in order to participate in the partnership without being passive or having only the role of accomplishing with the orientations of the donor.

The relevance of this study within the available literature, lies in the fact that, in the first place, it aims to analyse the partnership at the local level, it is, between NGOs and CBOs and not exclusively between international NGOs and local NGOs; in the second, the study will move beyond the function of partnership and will seek to understand the mechanisms by which these relationships happen in practical terms. Thus, I will seek to unpack what happens in practice within the partnership between NGOs and CBOs, moving beyond the rhetoric of partnership mentioned in the official documents.

In terms of contribution to the existent literature, the relevance of the study lies in the fact that it opens space for the identification of different elements which can constitute the basis of the partnership between NGOs and CBOs and not only the function of funding.

The results of the study showed that the partnership between NGOs and CBOs is based on complementarities, mutual benefit, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both NGOs and CBOs though from different value. Also it showed that both entities (NGOs and CBOs) participate in decision-making process what signifies that both have a role in the process. The partnership is also characterised by conflict and risk for both due to the differences of interests that exist. Though, as the partnership is valuable for both, NGOs and CBOs will engage in developing strategies to minimise the conflict and risk while at the same

[3]Fumo 1995; José and Monteiro 1995; Silva 1995;

time seek to maximise and maintain the relationship. The locus of conflict is essentially linked to financial issue which can in extreme cases cause the breaking of partnership.

The study is divided into five (5) main sections namely: this introduction with the description of the study, including the objectives, researches questions, rationale, contribution to the existent literature, and also the background on the topic in Mozambique context. The second part contains the literature review which also includes the theoretical framework and the concepts used in this study. In the third part I present the methodology, which justifies the data collection method and sampling. The results and analysis of the study are presented in the fourth part. And finally, I present the conclusions of the study.

### 1.2.1 Non-Governmental Organisation and Community-Based Organisations

According to Lewis (2009), there is no consensus about the definition of non-governmental organisation, due to the fact that, "NGOs are a diverse groups of organisations that defy generalisation, ranging from small informal groups to large formal agencies". The author also considers that another reason has to do with the fact that NGOs play different roles and take different shapes within and across different societies and however being non-profit some generate profits.

Da Conceição (1993) considers that NGOs are organisations which are not governmental, are non-partisan, are voluntary-based and are dedicated to national or regional development and can also benefit from international aid.

Hanlon (1997a:31) highlights two different types of NGOs. The first are the organisations based on their members, such as trade unions, women's groups, peasant's associations just to mention some. In terms of nature they can be national or international and they exist in the interest of their own members. The second are the big organisations dedicated to charity work and with a non-profit basis. They exist to the interest of others and in terms of their nature they can be national or international. Hanlon (1997a), states that some other distinction between the two types is the one used for example in South Africa, which is between NGOs and CBOs. The CBOs correspond with the first group and the NGOs with the second group

described above. The author points out that in Mozambique both are known as NGOs, and are part of the general group of civil society.

CBOs, in their turn are small organisations initiated by local residents and based within the communities they serve (Chechetto-Sales and Geyer 2006). They are also considered grassroots organisations and can be formally or informally constituted, whose members belong to the community they operate in (Ndlovu 2004: 8). They are non-profit and depend majorly on external funds. They also lack resources such as communication technology, physical premises, material and expert human resources (Symes 2002).

The line which separates NGOs from CBOs is tenuous and especially if considering the kind of work both execute, my understanding is that NGOs and CBOs are dynamic organisations in a permanent process of change. Nevertheless, in general it is possible to distinguish a CBO from a NGO especially if we look at their organisational and financial capacity and at the volume of work they undertake and at the capacity of human resources in both types of organisations.

To sum up, I consider the following characteristics typical of the NGOs: are voluntary; non-partisan; non-profit making; are much institutionally organised than the CBOs; they work at national and international level; they operate in the interest of others.

And the CBOs are: voluntary, grassroots organisations, in general they work in the interest of their own members; are highly dependent on external aid; they lack of resources (human, infrastructure, communication), sustainability; normally work within the boundaries of their communities.

## 1.3 Background

Since Mozambique won its independence from Portugal in 1975, two main development models were adopted up to now. The first marked the rupture with the Portuguese colonial state in which the state was the agent of economic and social development. It was the centralised state-led model whose objective was the construction of a society free from the "exploitation of one man over another". The second was the neoliberal model, when Mozambique adopted the World Bank (WB) and IMF (International Monetary Fund) programs in the middle 80s. The shift from centralised state-led to neoliberalism was the result of the failure of the state in promoting social and economic development.

Jose (2005) considers that the 80s were the era of the emergence of civil society in Mozambique with a crescent role in external aid. Still, according to Jose (2005)[4], neoliberal policies had a negative impact[5] on the social and economic life of Mozambique specifically with regard to employment due to the privatisation of industry. This analysis can be framed in the most general approach that links the failure of the economic performance in developing countries to the introduction of neoliberal policies.

Without intending to deny the view which links the failure of economic growth in developing countries to the emergence of neoliberalism, analyzing the particular case of Mozambique it is inevitable to bring to the discussion some other elements which marked the 80s. The 80s were a very difficult period in Mozambique in terms of economic, social and political issues, as the country was subsumed by an internal and external war and also assailed by a severe drought, and the colonial heritage was another important consideration which played a crucial role in determining what the country experienced in the post-independence period.

A few years after Mozambique became independent the state had an important role in the process of development. At this period it assisted a decline of the production due to the

[4] This study focus specifically on the case of the privatisation of the cashew-nut industry in Mozambique;

[5] During this process around 100 thousand workers lost their jobs, between 1987 and 2000, (Pitcher 2002 cited by Jose 2005).

increasing of consumption, increment on salaries especially for the categories of the poorer public officers, the elimination of the health and education taxes and the control of prices in some basic needs goods (Adam 1997: 6). Parallel to this, the economic apparatus and the rural marketing network were weak as the result of the abandonment of thousands of qualified people, traders and owners of manufacturing. In some cases the abandonments were accompanied by sabotage of the equipment and buildings by the former Portuguese owners (Egero 1992: 160, cited by Jose 2005: 4). Still, "the rural marketing network collapsed as Portuguese and Asian traders either fled to Portugal or moved to the cities to take over businesses there" (Hanlon: 1984:72, cited by Jose 2005:5).

Externally, Mozambique was affected by Rhodesian cross-border attacks as revenge against Samora Machel's support to the ex- Rhodesia (Zimbabwean) liberty movements at that time. In turn, Mozambican government also reacted with armed force and applied economic sanctions to Rhodesia, barring access to the harbour[6], which represented a severe rupture to the Mozambican economy, as it was the most important income to the country[7] (Christie 1996).

And internally, Mozambique was involved in a devastating civil war, with military attacks from Mozambique National Resistance Movement (RENAMO[8] or MNR) and South Africa, which caused severe damage to the economy and people's lives. Concomitantly, the decisions[9] undertaken by the South African government over the mining migratory work also represented voluminous damages to the Mozambican economy (Christie 1996).

Hanlon (1997b) consider that the war, drought and floods that were affecting Mozambique in the early 80s, brought about serious pressure on the economy what led the government to ask for external aid as the government was not in any condition to tackle the situation through its own resources. The country was thus, forced to adhere to the WB and IMF, as a condition of being awarded international aid. In 1984 Mozambique was partnered to the WB and IMF (Hanlon 1997b; Adam 1997: 9).

---

[6] Rhodesia's nearest sea port for import and export of goods and supplies;

[7] It is estimated that Mozambique suffered losses of 600 million U.S. dollars, representing "more than twice the value of its annual exports [...] in its best year of foreign trade, 1981." (Christie 1996).

[8] In Portuguese: Resistência Nacional Moçambicana (RENAMO);

[9] South African government reduced the recruitment of labour force to around 30% and also made the decision that Mozambique could use 60% of the mining workers salary to buy gold in a preferential price.

Thus, as the country was already experiencing difficulties due to the above- mentioned factors, which initiated the failure of the state, the shift from state-led development model to neoliberalism appeared as an additional element. Therefore, I consider that all these elements[10] contributed and initiated the failure of the state. So the introduction of neoliberal policies can't be seen as the unique cause of most of the economic failure in Mozambique in the period post-independence. This situation brought about the emergence of civil society in Mozambique.

The intensification of NGOs' impact is a recent[11] phenomenon located in the period post civil war as neither the colonial administration, nor the post independence governance allowed the emergence of movements of the type of NGOs. However with the constitutional revision in 1990[12] that established among others individual rights, the right to free association opened a space for national civil society organization. The civil society had an important role during the establishment of the democratic process in Mozambique as well as during the period of reconstruction post war, helping in relocating action and creation of social infra-structures (Fumo 1995: 58).

For instance, with the end of the civil war between Mozambique Front Liberation's[13] (FRELIMO) and RENAMO, there were, "pressing reasons for NGOs[14] to support the country when invited to do so in the mid-1980s". The colonial heritage is another issue to be considered, as "Frelimo's government had inherited largely centralised government machinery and lack of educated and experienced officials, particularly in the lower echelons". It was in this context that NGOs such as the Save the Children Fund "felt there was a strong case for working with the government in order to build up its capacity" especially at provincial and district levels (Thomas 1992:17).

---

[10] Colonial heritage, drought, and floods, internal and external wars;
[11] In 1990, it is estimated that there were only 10 NGOs in Mozambique. In 1995, these numbers increased for more those 100 NGOs (Fumo 1995: 58).
[12] The legislation which regulate the right to associate was promulgated in 1991;
[13] In Portugue: Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO);
[14] International NGOs;

In terms of numbers, Mozambique assisted in overseeing a large growth in civil society organisation, as the following data show: In 1990, it was estimated that there were only 10 NGOs in Mozambique and in 1995 it increased to more than 100 (Fumo 1995: 58); in 2006[15] the number of civil society organisations was estimated at 5000. The existence of NGOs was predominating within civil society organisations, whose vast majority were associations (92%), either religious (53%) or political, advocacy and legal ones (25%) and only 2% are associations of an educational nature. In 2007, the number of civil society organization is estimate at 5119[16] (FDC 2007). These numbers suggest that civil society constituted an important sector within the Mozambican context.

[16] Source: FDC: Civil society index Mozambique 2007; This constitute the most exhaustive study to date of civil society in Mozambique. However, it does not separate within the associations how many are CBOs. In numerical terms there is a gap in Mozambican literature regarding the existence of civil society.

# Chapter 2: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

## 2.1 Literature review

For the purpose of this study I have identified two (2) main bodies of literature, namely: neoliberalism and the emergence of civil society in developing countries, partnership and aid international relations. It also includes literature related to agency theory, the concepts of social capital and power which were used in this study.

### 2.1.1 Neoliberalism and the emergence of civil society in developing countries

Neoliberalism is defined as a theory which defends that well- being will be achieved "by the maximisation of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterised by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade", wherein the state has the role of creating the conditions for a free market and to deal with military, defense, police and juridical issues. In terms of social development the state also have a minimal intervention as a developmental agent (Harvey 2007: 23).

The literature suggests that the introduction of neoliberal policies followed by the emergence of civil society especially in the third world has to do with the failure of the state in leading economic and social development. The centralised state-led model of development, intended to boost industrialisation and entrepreneurship through state intervention gained traction in Africa by the late 1970s, with the emergence of the new independent nations. However, the consequences of the centralised state-led model in many countries especially in Africa were catastrophic, characterised by highly inefficient state enterprises or parastatals as it showed incapacity in delivering developmental outcomes in a sustained and sustainable way, which resulted in a severe economic crisis (Fritz and Menocal 2006: 8). The failure of the state was associated with "state capture" by influential groups which used the state to achieve their own interests rather than promoting a developmental vision (Malloy 1977 cited by Fritz and Menocal 2006).

This period is also known as the period of the "failure of development", in most post-colonial countries, with the decrease of real per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and reversal on the welfare gains achieved since independence in areas like food consumption, health and education. "This has been the context in which there has been an explosive growth in the presence of Western as well as local non-governmental organisations in Africa", which form an important part of "development machine" (Manji and O'Coill 2002: 2-3).

The replacement of the state by civil society within neoliberal developmental discourse created new forms and spaces of power, wherein the state was no longer the only entity that purchased power as the situation brought about a new form of social regulation and shaped the relationship between state and civil society in terms of power relation. Thus as the result of the decline of the power of the state, there was a need to introduce new forms of social regulation (Giddens 1991:35). It implied a sharing of power between the state and civil society.

With discussion above, I have realised that there is a narrow link between the emergence of NGOs in African countries, neoliberal policies and the failure of the state. Neoliberalism allowed the emergence of NGOs, in a context that the state was unable to lead social development. In this context the NGOs (national or international) played and still play a pivotal role in social development providing social support through implementation of development projects establishing partnerships with various CBOs.

### 2.1.2 Partnership and Aid Relation within Social Development Projects

In the post-independence period in many African countries, development programs were oriented according to the model of industrialised countries in which knowledge and plans were transferred from the west, to solve problems in the third world without a strong involvement of the beneficiaries. The discourse beyond this model defended the existence of a unique path to development based on the industrialised countries (Wignara 1989: 34).

Thus, the establishment of partnerships with CBOs was a way to invert the prior situation ensuring greater participation of the beneficiaries. It was based on the idea that the CBOs, enjoy legitimacy within the range of beneficiaries of aid, and they have the role of interacting

with the community and to create relationships of co-operation and trust in order to understand the needs of the community and design projects that respond to these needs (Kamat 2004: 160; Jose and Monteiro 1995: 33).

Mansouri and Rao (2003), define community participation as the active involvement of a defined community in at least some aspects of the project design and implementation whose key objective is the involvement of local knowledge into the project's decision-making process, with the objective that the projects will be well designed.

Thus, the establishment of partnerships is not an end in itself but a means to ensure greater involvement and integration of the desires and needs of the beneficiaries of the projects. In other words, the partnerships aimed to develop the beneficiaries themselves to be actors in their own development, which meant that they had to participate in actions that led to their own development by identifying problems and optimum solutions by themselves. It is within this context that the concept of participation gained space within the development arena.

Robert Chambers in the 90s developed the methodology of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), which enhanced the site and was meant to empower people "to determine much of the agenda" and invert the prior top-down model of development programs implementation (Kapoor 2002: 103).

Looking at the establishment of partnerships, especially with local organisations whether NGOs or CBOs, as a way to ensure the participation of communities, raises some questions about the process of participation itself regarding its efficiency in relation to the way the process occurs. In practical terms, community participation approach appears as limited because it does not consider the issue of the inclusiveness of other members of the community, the role of the facilitators and the personal behaviour of elites overshadow, and sometimes ignores the issue of legitimacy, justice, power and the politics of gender and difference (ibid).

In the same vein with Kapoor (2002), Heek (1999:3) also states that community participation is not as "participative" as it is thought to be, as the decisions taken during the process are the ones which are "organizationally recognized", or the ones from the powerful actors. The

author adds that the concept fails to ignore the existence of inequalities within the communities, as those who participate "are those individuals who are themselves powerful through position, knowledge, or who are representatives of powerful groups or who, more prosaically, have the power of being publicly articulate". Also, the role of the external facilitators interferes in the way the process takes place and shapes the kind of decisions that are made. Furthermore because people who participate are not selected from the marginalised, it excludes some groups from the "participative process" (Heek 1999). In this regard, the results presented as being of the community come from an interrelation between intra and extra community, so people are not empowered to build their own management of development projects, but "to take part in the modern sector of "development societies""(Mosse 2001:182 cited by Williams 2004: 565).

In the specific case of the role of CBOs in this process, it is important to note that not all communities' interests will be considered, because the decisions that would be taken would only reflect the interests of the people present in the community auscultation. Considering that the communities are not homogeneous, and there exists different groups, how will representativeness be ensured? At the same time it is also equally important to consider the influence of the NGOs' facilitators, the interests of the NGOs that fund the projects as they can also influence the process. Though it depends on how the process is driven as the problem is not with the model itself but with the way the process occurs

Williams (2004:565), also puts some skepticism regarding the real purpose of participation because of the issues raised above what makes the author consider that participatory development is an excuse used by NNGOs not to be blamed for the weaknesses of projects, and in their place to blame the communities as they "are not participatory" or as "bad participants" .

Ignoring the existence of power relation and differences within the participatory cannot ensure that the opinions and needs of all groups will be considered. Also, taking into account that the individuals who guide the process have their own interests and points of views they are prone to influence the process. Furthermore, it is important to think about how will be chosen the topics to be discussed in terms of areas of services that the NGOs or CBOs operate on. Related to this last point, my argument is that the interest of the NGO may

influence the choice of the communities' priorities. So, the identified needs will correspond to the choices of the present members of the community within the available options brought by the NGOs. And thus participation seems to be a way to legitimate the projects as reflecting the needs of the beneficiaries while they reflect either the needs of powerful groups or the ones of the NGOs. However it is not to deny the role of participation but to emphasize that if the elements raised above are not considered participation will not bring different results from the top-down model.

Understanding the issue of community participation within the discussion of partnership is important to this study as it will help me to understand the decision making about projects design and activities implementation. It will be important to see how the process of community participation occurs in practice and at what extent it brings the community to decide about their own development. Linked to this, it will also be important to analyse how the process of community participation inform the decision making especially regarding the project design and activities implementation within NGOs and CBOs' partnership.

Partnership is defined as "a mutual commitment for long term, for co-operation on the basis of a common vision of respect and mutual understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each party". It is a type of relationship and not all relationships are partnerships. It goes beyond a simple financial relationship and constitutes a link between partners guided by common objectives, mutual benefits, exchange of information, resources, experience and power, and even trust and mutual respect in which all partners are benefited but without losing their own identity (Silva 1995:42).

Most of the relevant literature which examines the topic of partnership show that partnership is characterised by the unequal exercise of power in which the determinant element is the possession of money and other resources. It means that, whosoever has got money can exercise power over who doesn't.

In an article entitled "NGOs without Aid: Beyond the global soup kitchen", Malhotra (2000), examines the future of the nature of partnerships in the context of decreased international aid to finance development projects in the south. The author argues that funding represents one of the most important parameter in the evolution of relations between NNGOs and SNGOs.

Taking into account the importance of funding, equal partnerships have only been possible with small NGOs without the role of funding, and which only act in policy dialogue and advocacy actions, unlike these cases, other partnerships are characterised by the exercise of power by the NNGOs.

Thus, within civil society the development actions partnerships are shaped by the possession of financial strength and is considered that the possession of money determines who exercise power, and in the specific case of the relationship between the NGOs and the CBOs, I would say that the NGOs exercise power over the CBOs if I consider money as the crucial element that link both organizations.

Money seems to be an important element considering that most of the CBOs are dependent on external aid. Though in my point of view it doesn't explain how the partnership between NGOs and CBOs occurs in practical terms, taking into account other interests which exist beyond money issue. It leads me to consider the existence of other elements which inform the establishment of partnership between NGOs and CBOs.

Crawford (2003:153), in an analysis of partnerships between international donors and the government during the governmental reform in Indonesia, observed that there were evidences of asymmetrical power relations between North and South, expressed through aid relation, despite the use of the terms "partnership" and "national ownership". His study showed that "behind the rhetoric of "partner-ship" lies the exercise of power by international agencies", with local actors on the ground having no control over the process, especially in the decision-making about activities implementation. The author considers that Indonesian's contribution is purely nominal, because in fact who decide are the international agencies. The use of the term partnership is purely semantic and is a guise to legitimise the intervention of international donors in the political and economic reforms of sovereign states, without being criticised for it.

Crawford (2003) concludes pointing that his findings:

> *"...support much of Fowler's analysis of 'partnership' as a "terminological Trojan Horse", appearing benign, but having the concealed intent of influencing a country's*

*development choices more effectively, thus mystifying power asymmetry and acting as a more subtle form of external power imposition"* (Fowler 2000: 7 cited by Crawford 2003:157).

Partnerships between NNGOs and SNGOs have a different nature from the ones between NGOs and CBOs in implementing local development projects, considering that they operate on a different level from the one of the NGOs and CBOs that I am studying. However the important questions of funding, the unequal access to information, to global centre of power and decision-making, may also be taken into account in the analysis of partnerships between the NGOs and CBOs what create differences between them.

It is based on these differences that Fowler (1990:12) questions: "how can partnerships be created out of relationships where the parties involved differ so much in their roots, contexts, and resources"? Fowler's question can be framed in the discussions around the partnership between NNGOs and SNGOs which consider that the relationships between partnership and NNGOs and SNGOs are asymmetric and are characterised by the exercise of power by the NNGOs, where the issue of funding and possession of other resources play a crucial role. In this regard the author point out that:

"*Having skills and resources to transfer to the South does not in itself make a Northern development NGO legitimate. And it is here that Southern NGOs have a special weight to put in the partnership scales, for they provide the legitimacy for Northern NGOs that support them. (...) a unique contribution which Southern NGOs can make to the partnership balance is the provision of legitimacy for Northern development NGOs"* (Fowler 1990: 13).

Fowler's (1990) considerations led me to think that if the CBOs do not have the same resources as the NGOs, such as access to the core of decision making and power and funding they may participate in the partnership with different values. Thus, the partnership between NGOs and CBOs may be oriented by the way NGOs and CBOs perceive each other's values, gains and benefits they achieve through partnership.

The literature on partnership guides me to focus my study on the influence of each partner in decision making-process identifying the different strategies both use to maintain and miximise the partnership.

Decision-making is a process of making a choice from a number of alternatives to achieve a desired result (Eisenfuhr 2011 cited by Lunenburg 2010). There are different models of decision-making approach which are based on whether decision making is located in its rationality or not. Although (Mitroff and Linstone 1993 cited by Turpin and Marais 2004) propose the multiple perspectives approach. The multiple perspectives view classifies decision-making as either being technical, organisational or individual in nature. And Das and Teng (1999) seem to corroborate this view considering that strategic decision processes are influenced by some bias.

Decision-making constitutes an important aspect to consider as I seek to understand the relationship between NGOs and CBOs underpinned by a contract, wherein the NGO delegates the CBO to implement activities projects in the community. In this section I will analyse the process of decision making in identifying partners and establishment of partnership. I will look at the elements that influence the decision making about the matter looking at the different process of identifying partners.

### 2.1.3 Theoretical Framework

There are a variety of forms of partnerships within civil society in general and in particular between NGOs and CBOs and this specific study is about the partnership between NGOs and CBOs which establish agreements for the implementation of specific activities. The NGOs provide material, institutional and financial resources to the CBOs to implement activities in the communities. Thus, agency theory helps to understand this specific type of relationship.

According to Eisenhardt (1989: 58-59):

> *"... agency theory is directed at the ubiquitous agency relationship, in which one part (the principal) delegates work to an-other (the agent), who performs that work. Agency theory attempts to describe this relationship using the metaphor of a contract*

(Jensen & Meckling 1976 cited by Eisenhardt 1989). *Agency theory is concerned with resolving two problems that can occur in agency relation-ships. The first is the agency problem that arises when (a) the desires or goals of the principal and agent conflict and (b) it is difficult or expensive for the principal to verify what the agent is actually doing. The problem here is that the principal cannot verify that the agent has behaved appropriately. The second is the problem of risk sharing that arises when the principal and agent have different attitudes toward risk. The problem here is that the principal and the agent may prefer different actions because of the different risk preferences".*

Thus, Agency Theory

> *"(...) aids in understanding the problems that arise when one actor (the principal), relies on another (the agent) to provide services on his or her behalf. Given that the agent often possesses the information, knowledge, or skill that he or she needs in order to act on behalf of the principal, we can presume that the agent will not always act in ways that are consistent with the principal's expectations"* (Berle and Means, 1932, cited by Miller 2002: 431).

If Agency theory is applied to the relationships between NGOs and CBOs, the NGO can be seen as the "Principal" and the CBO as the "Agent". Both are institutions with their own interests and objectives. And the differences of interests and objectives may constitute a risk for the NGOs as they cannot always control or predict what the CBOs are going to do when implementing the activities. In this sense, the NGOs must ensure that they choose the right partners and establish mechanisms of control in order to reduce the potential risk. According to Eisenhardt (1989: 64), risk has to do with the future of the organisations, as it can "bring prosperity, bankruptcy, or some intermediate outcome, and that the future is only partly controlled by the organisations members". Thus, it signifies that both NGOs and CBOs don't have full control of the risk as it can be sometimes unpredicted.

It will be under agency theory approach that I will frame my analysis and I will seek to analyse how the difference of interests, the existing risk influence the partnership between NGOs and CBOs.

### 2.1.3.1 Social Capital

Bourdieu defines Social Capital as:

> *"[... ] the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word"* (Bourdieu 1986: 250).

Bourdieu sees the social space as a field of battle where agents (individuals and groups) prepare strategies to maintain or improve their social position (Bonamino *et al* 2010: 488). Bourdieu also considers that society is composed of a plurality of social fields and each field has its own profile which depends on the importance that is given to each form of capital. The concept of social capital is a collective phenomena and its volume depends on the size of the network and connections that a given agent can mobilise. The field of power is a field of forces and struggles for power among the holders of different forms of capital. It constitutes a place of competition between different forms of capital where all agents possess a certain type of capital, and as a result it leads to a balance and sharing of power (Siisiainen 2003).

For the purpose of the present study the concept of capital will help me to understand how NGOs and CBOs use their capital in order to maximise their relationship and achieve more benefits and exercise power within the context they work in. The concept of social capital also gives importance to the network and connections that the actor is inserted in what means that the network relationship can also play an important role as a source of power and influence.

### 2.1.3.2 Power

The concept of social capital brings up the necessity to understand the notion of power. And for the purposes of this study I will be using Robert Dahl and Greenstein's concepts of power.

Dahl defines power as the capacity of acting in a particular way in order to provoke changes in actions or predispositions. Power is in this definition related to the concept of influence. And influence is defined as "a relation among actors such that wants, desires, preferences, or intentions of one or more actors affect the actions or predispositions to act, of one or more other actors" (Nagel 1975: 29, cited by Dahl 1976: 30).

And Greenstein (2003a) conceives power "as a set of practices and discourses that govern the interactions between social actors", and defines the three dimensions of the power, namely:

> "*Social power (access by individuals and groups to resources and control over their allocation), institutional power (strategies employed by groups and institutions in exercising administrative and legal authority), and discursive power (shaping social, political and cultural agendas through contestations over meanings)*" (Greenstein 2003a:1).

Regarding this issue Greenstein (2003a:2), considers that state and civil society represents spaces of power, and are not mutually exclusive and highlighting the importance of power in its discursive dimension, the author argues that it shapes the social, political and cultural agenda, also interests and identities. In the same vein, Habib (2005) considers that the institutions within civil society must be seen as diverse and plural, which reflects diverse and even contradictory political and social agendas. This plurality and diversity shapes the relationships between state and civil society.

The emergence of civil society in the third world introduces new forms of power relations, in which civil society appears as a complementary sector of the state. Civil society, acting as the legitimate representative of the poor the state does no longer constitute the unique entity that retains the exercise of power. The liberalisation which accompanied the neoliberal era

introduces a new form of being in terms of civil rights, giving voice and the opportunity of the exercise of power to different institutions and social groups (Habib 2005).

Considering the different dimensions of power and the notion of influence will enable me to identify different possibilities of the exercise of power either for NGOs or CBOs, based on different sources.

# Chapter 3: Methodology and Ethical appraisal

## 3.1. Methodology

The study was conducted with two NGOs, four CBOs, respectively: ActionAid, FDC, AJN, Nivenyee[17], Ntwanano[18] and Reencontro[19]. Though, I have worked in-depth with ActionAid, Reencontro and Ntwanano. I have worked with a total of 18 respondents, specifically: 10 from CBOs and 8 from NGOs. The interviews were undertaken in Portuguese[20] and were transcribed and translated into English.

The study was carried out in Nampula and Gaza provinces and capital Maputo. Nampula and Gaza provinces constitute the two provinces which have the highest concentration of civil society organisations in Mozambique. In numeric terms, Nampula has 975, corresponding to 18.75% and Gaza with 15.3% of 5,199 civil society organisations. And the choice of the Capital Maputo has to do with the fact that it constitutes the core of decision-making, as all the NGOs I have worked with are headquartered in the capital Maputo (FDC 2007).

The main documents consulted are: strategic plans, report activities, memoranda of understanding, contracts of service provision, constitution of the CBOs.

In both, NGOs and CBOs were interviewed people in the following positions: project coordinator, program officer, project manager, knowledge management and partnership development. The choice of the respondents was dependent on the organisational structure.

[17] Nivenyee, is Emakua word, a dialect spoken in Nampula and Cabo Delgado provinces and part of Niassa province, North of Mozambique. In English it means "wake up".
[18] Ntwanano is a word in a dialect from Gaza province, south of Mozambique, and in English it means unity or union; in a direct translation it means "understanding" in English.
[19] Reencontro is a Portuguese word and means in a direct translation "meet again", but here the word is used as meaning "reconstruction", "rehabilitation".
[20] Portuguese is the official language in Mozambique, it constitutes the working language.

### 3.1.1 Sampling

The sampling method to select the NGOs, CBOs was the purposive sampling method. According to (Henning *et al* 2004: 71), purposive sampling "look toward people who fit the criteria of desirable participants. These criteria came from the researcher knowledge of the topic (…)". In this context, in these provinces I chose to work with these NGOs because I had prior information about their work with some specific CBOs. I also knew, for instance, that they constitute organisations which implement activities with a significant number of CBOs for long period (more than 10 years in various provinces) and have experienced both direct and indirect project implementation during this period, what will allow me to get different experiences, opinions, perceptions and significances. In order to ensure a balanced research outcome, I worked with one international and one national NGO, as they constitute the two main types of organisations in Mozambique that work in partnership with the CBOs, providing technical and financial support.

The information about FDC was accessible to me through the internet and people very close to me who had worked with the organisations. Regarding ActionAid, I have in the past worked with this organisation, though I did not have a close relationship with CBOs, my work was linked to the government institutions. All these elements facilitated me to get prior information about the topic I am studying and it also allowed me to identify the CBOs to work with. Thus, I have chosen the CBOs that were working or had worked in partnership with one of the prior identified NGOs. The choice of the CBOs was my own responsibility with no interference of the NGOs.

### 3.1.2 Data collection methods

To start the field work permission to undertake the interview was obtained from the NGOs and CBOs. The interviews with the various organisations (NGOs and CBOS) took place during working hours in the offices of each organisation, though it did not interfere with the normal processes of the organisations as the participants were given the freedom of deciding when the interviews should take place.

All the interviews were audio recorded and permission was obtained from each organisation and also the participant had the right to decide if they allow or do not allow the interview to be recorded despite the permission from the organisation to ensure that they are not being forced by the organisation to do so.

To grasp the theme, I needed to gather data such as opinions, interpretations and discourses in order to understand, explain and describe the phenomena in analysis. I also intended to answer the question "what" happens within the relationship between NGOs and CBOs.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990:19) "qualitative methods can be used to uncover and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known". In his turn, Bryman (1996) also notes that qualitative research is the one which emphasises words rather than quantification in collecting and analyzing data. As my study is about experiences, significances, perceptions, opinions and discourses, in order to respond the research question, the data were analysed through qualitative method.

Henning *et al* (2004: 41) also consider that, a study which aims to get "an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved and, the interest in the study relies more in the process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovering rather than confirmation" constitutes a case study.

Thus, a case study is a particularistic investigation, which means that the researcher pores over a specific situation supposed to be unique or special, seeking to discover what is the most essential and characteristic in it, contributing thus for the understanding of the entire phenomena (Ponte 2006: 2, cited by Araujo *at al* 2008).

To recap, this study constitutes an analysis of a specific type of relationship between NGOs which provide financial and technical support and CBOs that implement activities in development projects in Mozambique, and the study will be carried out with only 4 CBOs and 2 NGOs and not a representative number of all NGOs and CBOs. The choice of the CBOs and NGO was not guided of the representativeness of them, as I had showed before. Also the study seeks to answer the question "what" which presupposes description, understanding and characterization of a particular phenomenon.

In terms of method of data collection I have used in-depth semi structured interviews and document analysis.

Interviews enabled me to have a more detailed description about the events and processes that had occurred in the organisation integrating different perspectives. Also it enabled me to capture the perceptions and interpretations that the participants have about the significance of the partnership (Weiss 1995: 10). And in-depth-semi structured interviews involve a clear list of issues that need to be addressed and questions that need to be answered by the participants. They also include some level of flexibility in the sequence in which questions are asked and answered, and the participants can speak broadly on the topic under discussion (Greenstein 2003b). It was within this logic that I undertook the interviews in order to get a deep understanding of the phenomena

For document analysis I used primary documents such as, strategic plan, memoranda of understanding, honourable mention, services provision contracts, partnership politics, activities plan and reports and constitutions of the CBOs. The use of the documents enabled me to understand how in institutional terms the relationship, the role and responsibilities of each partners are understood. Then, I had to compare with what happens in practice, as my study is more about the practical terms of the relationship than institutionally.

I also used discourse analysis to interpret the information contained in the primary documents and interviews. It was important to my study considering that in order to understand the significances I had to disclose "what is said in the texts" and "what lies inside and outside the text" in terms of development discourses (Burman 2003: 4).

### 3.1.3 Methodological experience

In terms of methodological experience in using these instruments for data collection in general it was a positive experience, nevertheless I faced some constraints. Regarding the interviews, I realised that despite the fact that the respondents have allowed the recording I felt that in general they were concerned about that.

To get the documents constituted the most difficult thing during the process of data collection. Except one NGO and two CBOs, all other organisations would agree to provide me the documents but then they would be very reluctant on providing them.

## 3.2 Ethical appraisal

The study was carried out with the help and co-operation of NGOs and CBOs, whose participants were the employees and in any circumstance the study dealt with the beneficiaries of the project (ordinary members of the community). In so doing, my research participants do not involve vulnerable categories. Before I started the field work, I got the organisations permission from the NGOs and CBOs and I provided information about the purpose and objectives of the research. A separate consent form to record the interviews was also obtained from the organisations.

Anonymity was guaranteed as I will not disclose any information to anyone external or internal to the NGOs and CBOs, except to my supervisor. I will be using codes to refer to the organisations and participants, for example: NGO1 and CBO1 for the organisations and R-NGO1-01 and R-CBO1-01 for the respondents.

It is important to mention that during the process of collecting data it wasn't possible to ensure total anonymity because other people knew who is going to participate or who participated in the interviews as it occurred during the work hours. Though, it can be minimised by the fact that the research report didn't disclose what was said by a given participant and specific details were omitted to ensure confidentiality.

# Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

## 4.1 Characteristics of the NGOs and CBOs

ActionAid: is a development organisation founded in 1972 in the United Kingdom, with a primary focus on health and education. ActionAid Mozambique (AAMOZ) is part of the federation of ActionAid Affiliates which is headquartered in South Africa, and operates in over 45 countries in Africa, Europe, America and Asia. AAMOZ has its national office in the capital Maputo and has a physical presence in six (6) provinces[21], namely: Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Zambézia, Inhambane, Gaza and Maputo. As part of the federation, AAMOZ has a dual identity: operating at a local and international level. AAMOZ has worked in Mozambique since 1988, in response to the emergency situation brought about by the 16 years of civil war. During this period the organisation passed through 3 phases in activities implementation, as follows:

**The first phase: from 1988-1994**: Direct implementation of an emergency response program, based on providing basic services to those affected by war and natural disasters; this phase coincided with ActionAid's International strategy called "Giving people Choices".

**The second phase: from 1995- 2002**: inserted in ActionAid's international strategy "Fighting Poverty Together", the approach during this phase included advocacy for the provision of the services required to meet basic needs through participatory methods. It marked a transition from emergency activities to development initiatives.

**The third phase: from 2003- 2011:** Characterised by the adoption of the "Human Rights Based Approach" (HRBA), involving programs for empowerment, solidarity advocacy and campaigning to secure human rights by and for poor and excluded people.

FDC: is a local not-for-profit grant making foundation that aims to strengthen the capacities of disadvantaged communities with a view towards overcoming poverty and promoting social

[21] While an International organisation AAMOZ has a physical presence in 4 (four) provinces, namely: Maputo, Zambézia, Nampula and Cabo Delgado.

justice in Mozambique. FDC was created in 1990, first as an association with the objective of reducing poverty and suffering for the majority of people in the context of civil war. In 1994, it was transformed into a Foundation and constitutes one of the first local civil society organisations in Mozambique.

AJN: is a local association created in 2001 located in Nacala-Porto Municipality in Nampula Province. Its aim is to promote youth engagement in development activities in the areas of education, HIV, Orphans and vulnerable Children and activities against drug and alcohol abuse.

Ntwanano: is a local association created in 2003 by People Living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS), located in Chibuto Municipality in Gaza Province. Its aim is to improve the quality of life of HIV infected individuals and their families through the provision of community based palliative care and support and the strengthening of coping mechanisms by providing Basic Health Care and Support in the Home for people living with HIV/AIDS.

Reencontro: is a local association created in 2000 to assist Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVCs) in Gaza province. Its aim is to improve the quality of life of orphans & other vulnerable children and their families through the provision of comprehensive care and support and the strengthening of coping mechanisms by providing Care and Support to OVCs affected by HIV/AIDS.

Nivenyee: is a local association created in 2000 in Nampula city, by people living with HIV, especially young people. It was registered as an organisation in 2001. Nivenyee is located in Nampula city. The activities are focused on HIV which includes home-based care and sensitising.

## 4.2 Types of Partnerships between NGOs and CBOs

Based on this study I have identified 3 (three) types of partnerships which are established by the NGOs and CBOs that participated in this study, namely: activities implementation, co-ordination and capacity building partnership.

Activities implementation partnership: NGOs and CBOs establish a partnership in which the NGOs provide funds and technical support to the CBOs to implement activities during a certain period of time. This type of partnership is regulated by contracts of service provision or memoranda of understanding[22].

Co-ordination partnership: Different CBOs, NGOs and Governmental organisations, meet periodically to share experiences, information, outcomes, especially if they work in the same activity area, or are funded by the same NGO or Donor. This type of partnership is meant, besides other purposes to reduce the overlapping of the activities by the different actors. The ties are normally informal and can be co-coordinated by the government, an NGO or CBO. All NGOs and CBOs mentioned are involved in this type of partnership.

Capacity building partnership: This partnership does not involve direct fund transfer and it is only about technical and capacity building support. It can be made through a formal or informal agreement (contract). The NGO provides to the CBO equipment or allocates an "expert" or "technical adviser" to the CBO.

To a certain extent these three different types of partnerships are interlinked and in many cases they are part of activities implementation partnership. However it is important to mention that they can exist separately or can constitute steps toward the establishment of the activities implementation partnership. For the purpose of this study the term partnership will be used referring to the activities implementation partnership which includes the other two types.

[22] It depends on the NGOs' terminology. For the use in this study I will be using the term "Contract", to refer to the formal document that links the partners institutionally.

## 4.3 Decision-Making Process: The process of identification of partners and establishment of partnership

### 4.3.1 The process of identification of partners

Through the findings, I have identified four (04) different ways by which NGOs and CBOs that participated in this study identify their partners, namely: NGO-CBO- Contact, CBO-NGO- Contact, public tender and creation of partner.

NGO-CBO contact: it occurs when a NGO contacts directly a CBO. The contact is directed to specific CBOs that the NGO has partnered before or can also be directed to CBOs which have never partnered with the NGOs. The NGOs stated that usually they contact those CBOs which they know their vision, mission, objectives, weakness, idiosyncrasies and performance through their own experience or through information from other NGOs, government or other CBOs. This way of identifying partners and establishing partnerships fits the way Silva (1995), understands the concept of partnership when considering that the partner already exists and must be identified, and the identification is oriented by a sharing of the same objectives, mutual trust and knowledge of each other.

CBO-NGO contact: The CBOs contact the NGOs and show interest in establishing a partnership with them. Normally the CBOs have already designed a project or planned some activities and submit it to a given NGO which they know fund projects in that activity area.

Tender: This is a mechanism used especially by the donors to disclose the availability of funds. Nevertheless, some NGOs also use this mechanism to identify their partners. There are two types of tender: directed and public tender. Directed tender is when the NGO selects some CBOs and directs the tender to them, whereas public tender is when the NGO discloses the tender for all the interested CBOs in the media (newspaper, radio, and internet). This is considered by the NGO[23] the most transparent method in selecting partners.

[23] Only one of the NGOs that participated in the study mentioned the use of this mechanism.

Creating partners: NGOs mobilise and incentive the communities in order to organise themselves in groups and create CBOs. Or the NGO helps in registering the already existing groups. Also the NGOs can identify other CBOs that are already registered and give them financial and capacity building support, establishing a much closer relationship with these CBOs. The NGOs will sponsor this CBO providing all the necessary conditions, such as offices (renting or building), vehicles, financial and programmatic training, and facilitating access to projects from other NGOs or donors. The NGO can also help in registering the CBO if it is not yet registered. Some of these CBOs establish a "NGO mother" and "CBO daughter" relationship which is durable, however with short term contracts that are renewable on an ongoing basis depending on the availability of funds, projects and the agreement of both partners.

### 4.3.2 Establishment of partnership

Both NGOs mentioned that prefer the mechanism of creating partners because there is a fear that the pre-existing CBOs are already structurally "addicted" and it is difficult to make them change their habits and work the way the NGOs desire. The NGOs stated that creating a CBO makes it is easier to shape them from the beginning to perform the way the NGO want.

The process of establishment of a partnership through the "creation of a partner" contradicts with Silva (1995) who states that the partner "should not be created, but identified". Still, given the social dynamics that exist behind the creation of associations, the question of cohesion, voluntarism, and common objectives among the members raises the question of what and whose interest really prevails beyond the "creation of a partner."

Looking at the CBOs as groups, they constitute formal organisations created by the members to perform a specific function in order to achieve a common goal in different aspects of social life. It implies that the creation of a CBO or groups must develop out of the community interest of people who create the CBO and it has to be a voluntary decision as a way to safeguard the existence of cohesion and common interests within the group (Virton 1996).

Due to lack of cohesion, the data indicated that some of these groups do not survive after the end of the project. In this respect a respondent discussed the issue of the failure of CBOs

created as follows: *"(...) I know for example that among the 50 associations that we have created, when the project finishes if we can maintain 25 percent to 50 percent still working will be quite satisfying. (...) I'm sure that when we leave part of the associations will also disappear"*. (Interview, R-NGO2-02, and 23rd January 2013).

The "CBOs daughters", are in most cases CBOs which were already registered and undertaking activities in the communities before they got into a partnership with a certain "NGO mother". With the establishment of partnership with the "NGO mother" they benefited of capacity building and these CBOs grow quickly in institutional terms and they maintain a special relationship with the "NGOs mother". This expresses the difference between "CBOs created" and "CBOs sponsored" in terms of the voluntarism of the members. The creation of the first are not based on their own interest whereas the last its creation is based on the voluntarism of the members and the NGOs only sponsor them and help with capacity building and funding.

Tender system is considered to ensure transparency in decision-making process about the identification of partners and funding provision. The notion of transparency can be framed around the rational model of decision-making. In Das and Teng (1998), the rational model of decision-making is based on the rationality of human behaviour which states that decisions are made in a "comprehensive and normative process in which top managers gather information, develop alternatives and then objectively select the optimal alternatives (Anderson 1983 and Nutt 1984 cited by Das and Teng 1998).

In practical terms the transparency of tender system in selecting partners can be different from what the NGOs consider it to be, taking into account that despite the fact that they "call for tenders" there is a tendency to prioritise the CBOs that are currently working or have previously worked with the NGO before.

It shows how trust influences the decision-making process in selecting partners and establishment of partnership. At the same time it shows that despite the discourse of transparency, in practical terms preference is given to the CBOs known and trusted by the NGOs. It is also important mentioning that it doesn't mean that the tender is only for these groups of CBOs, actually new CBOs are also considered but even in these circumstances the

NGOs will make their decisions based on references about the performance and reputation of the new CBOs given by other institution such as other CBOs, NGOs or government.

[24]Reputation can be defined as "what is generally said or believed about a person's or thing's character or standing". The definition suggests that differences might exist between "what agents say versus what they believe on a specific topic. In general, agents can communicate information concerning an individual even if they don't necessarily believe it. In this sense there is a need to separate group beliefs from forwarded information. The author considers that the agent will ultimately believe some information even if it was not gained from his own experience but provided by other agents in the form of shared beliefs. However the agent will select the sources of information that are most valuable or **reputable** from his point of view to give them credit and build up a consensus (Letia and Slavescu n.d). Thus reputation seems to be an element which leads to building of trust, which has to do with positive expectations in a risk situation (Boor and Holmes 1991; Gambeta 1989, cited by Das and Teng 2001).

The next excerpt from an interview with a respondent from a NGO may show how trust and reputation are linked and can exert influence in decision-making: *"The process of admission of a new organisation follows the same normal process of admission of any new individual to a given organisation. We have more or less the image which is described in the CV but after that we call the person to assess whether what is in the CV is true or not. With the CBOs, it is the same process. They apply but we are not going to move on to the next steep, until we have visited their facilities and seen if what they have said in the application form is really what they are in practice. It happens because we are about to invest millions of dollars in CBOs that maybe do not exist and only exist on paper or are not serious. It represents a very high risk. We also contact other organisation to get information about the reputation of the CBOs which we have never partnered with before. And sometimes other NGOs also contact us to get information about some CBOs we have worked in partnership with"*. (Interview, R-01-NGO2, 30th January 2013).

As reputation is a subjective factor it means that decision-making process may also be influenced by subjective elements such as people's own opinions, other NGOs' opinions including opinions from people who makes the decision.

[24] Oxford English Dictionary (quoted by Letia and Slavescu n.d).

The CBOs' volume of social capital plays an important role in constructing the image and reputation of the organisation and disseminating it to the other NGOs. The volume of social capital depends on the size of the network and the connections that the CBO can mobilise (Bourdieu 1986: 249; cited by Siisiainen 2003); it is to say that how much "good" connections the CBOs have much probably its reputation will be positive and much known by the other NGOs. And much probably the CBOs will attract more partners (Siisiainen 2003).

This excerpts of an interview with a respondents from a NGO, illustrates how the CBOs network and social capital can play an important role in building the image and reputation of the CBOs and influencing positively during the process of establishment of partnership. The respondent said: *"Nobody allocates money into a place where no one has gone before. That is why when applying for funds it is always asked about the CBOs' experience with money and also to mention the organisations the CBO has worked with before, because that money belongs to someone else (the donor), and no one wants to risk. This is the main problem with donor's money".* (Interview, R-NGO1-03, 22nd January).

As I have mentioned previously, trust can come from NGOs' own experience or through references from other organisations and also from people's opinions concerning the image and reputation of the CBO. It is important to mention that the NGOs themselves are aware of the subjectivity of the information coming from outside and most of them consider that such information is crucial for the effectiveness of the partnership. However some said that they are not crucial as they rely more on the institutional mechanisms. One respondent said the following about the matter: *"Information from other organisations counts a lot. But we have to say that* ***people*** *consult* ***people*** *from other organisations. Sometimes when we say one organisation consults another organisation we have to clarify that it is a person from a given organisation consulting another person from another organisation. And depending on the person being consulted that information can be different. It is not an institutional issue as such but it is a question of the person who is leading the organization or the person being consulted. Because if I have some sympathy for that organisation even if the CBO doesn't have a good performance I will give good references about the CBO. But if I have no*

*sympathy with that CBO I'll say: "Look, they are not good, and they will never change"".* (Interview, R-NGO1-03, 22nd January 2013, the emphasis is mine).

The statement above shows that decision-making is also influenced by subjectivity and personal opinions. However the NGOs stated that beside information they received from other informants they also assess the CBOs using internal tools.

In general, the data showed that the NGO-CBO contact method appears as the most used and the one which gives more probabilities that the partnership will be settled out. Conversely the contact CBO -NGO method seems to be the less used and the one which gives less probabilities that the partnership will be settled. The CBOs consider that the mechanism of establishing a partnership via contact CBO-NGO is "old fashionable and outdated" and it is most commonly used in the initial phase when the CBOs are created and do not have much experience and are not yet known by the NGOs.

NGOs and CBOs also considered that the process of the establishment of partnership is also determined by specific criteria such as: geographical and thematic activities areas; sharing of the same objectives, vision and mission;

The establishment of a partnership between NGOs and CBOs based on the gathered data also shows a tendency of NGOs having greater influence and power to decide on the process of identifying and establishment of partnership, though the CBOs also play an important role as they develop some strategies to attract the NGOs.

The data also showed that the CBOs decide on the establishment and the decision is influenced by the need to ensure and preserve their objectives and also to avoid conflicts with the communities when a given project is not acceptable by the community members. It shows that the CBOs can resist to work as "the executer arm" of funding NGOs using Fumo's (2005) expression.

It is also important to mention that in practical terms, even if the CBOs do not decide on the process they are not passive actors, they influence the process, as they seek to develop strategies to attract and maximise their relationship with the NGOs. Such strategies have to

do with the fact that they know what the NGOs are seeking in a partnership. Some mentioned strategies are: doing a good job and presenting satisfactory results; not to offend the NGO and maintain a good relationship with government institutions and community leaders; not to infringe the partnership rules or disobey the partner; meet deadlines and achieve targets; accomplish the contract terms; and above all avoid misusage of money.

The relationship with the donor is another element that influences the decision-making within the partnership, as the NGOs make sure that they will choose a partner who will operate within the contract terms which are their own rules and also the donor's rules.

### 4.3.3 The influence of the Donors in the partnership between NGOs and CBOs

The findings showed that the NGO will act and persuade the CBOs to act in order to not offend the donor, and the NGOs' decisions are informed by the same reason, it is, to avoid conflicts with the donor. The set of decisions include but are not limited to, breaking or maintenance of contracts, the decision in opting for direct implementation or through local partners. All the NGOs indicated that misusage of funds constitutes the main locus of the breaking of partnership.

Regarding the issue of breaking of contract, a respondent talking about a decision to break a contract with a CBO, said: *"it is clear that when you implement activities through CBOs normally you have a lot of problems during project implementation [...]. Then, to avoid problems with the donor we decided to break the contract and implement directly the project activities"*. (Interview, R-NGO2-02, 23rd January 2013).

The relationship with the donor can also influence for the continuity of the contracts between NGOs and CBOs even if the NGO is not satisfied with a given CBO. One respondent expressed it in these terms: *"we can't just wake up and say "it's over" because we have an agreement with the donor. When we signed the memoranda of understanding we mentioned that we will work with CBO a, b, c and d. [...]. Then we can't wake up and say: "we are no longer working with them". We have to understand that the donor also has his own commitments. Then, if we break that contract we will be confusing the entire chain.* **For that**

**reason** *sometimes we can maintain a partner for 3 years* **while we are not happy with him**". (Interview, R-NGO1-05, 24th January 2013, the emphasis is mine).

The relationship between the donor and the NGO interfere in the relationship between the NGOs and the CBOs. The position of the donor regarding some issues will be reflected in the position of the NGOs about the CBOs performance. And the decision will be made in accordance to the "desires" of the donor. Thus, the NGO works as the "guardian" of the donor.

### 4.3.4 The process of project design and activities implementation

The decision-making process about activities implementation starts with the first phase of the project design. The NGOs and CBOs consider that through community participation they ensure that the activities they will be implementing will reflect the needs of the beneficiaries.

The CBOs said that the choice of what activities are going to be implemented is informed by the mapping of the necessities of the communities with the involvement of the community leaders and above all by *"what the project allows. We have to look at the limits of the project. What doors the project opens, and doesn't allow [...]. For instance if the* NGO *says: "I have got this amount of money for certain activities", then we plan the activities according to the NGOs' conditions".* (Interview, R-CBO1-01, 20th November 2012).

The CBOs consider that the NGOs have a greater influence about what activities are going to be implemented and they do not have much space to negotiate, relying on what the project offers. Nevertheless they said: *"We participate* **in the decision making process about the project design and activities implementation,** *to the extent that within what is permitted we can choose what activities we are going to include in our activities plan. But we end up always depending on what the NGO brings".* (ibid, the emphasis is mine). The CBOs also mentioned that within what the project accepts they will choose the activities in accordance to the needs of the beneficiaries as they meet with the community leaders to map the priority needs.

From the side of the NGOs, they mentioned that the project design is informed by the real priorities and needs of the beneficiaries of the projects identified through community participation, wherein the community has the right to identify their problems including the solution to tackle them. The NGOs said that the project design starts in the communities where the members of the communities discuss their problems and advance solutions that will be considered during the project design process. They also mentioned that because they have been working for a long time in some areas it gives them a wide knowledge about the conditions, needs and specificities of those communities, according to them can allow them to design projects without consulting the communities which thus ensures that the real needs of the communities will be observed.

Thus, community participation constitutes the main element which informs the project design, both by the side of the NGOs and by the side of the CBOs. The process of community participation leads me to consider two main features, which are: the power relations and the role of community participation in relation to decision making about the project design and activities implementation.

Crawford (2003:142) identifies two different types of participation which are: "instrumental" and "genuine" (Brohman, 1996: 252, cited by Crawford 2003). Instrumental participation is associated with main-stream development organisations and is perceived as an instrument or mean to accomplish agency objectives. The involvement and consultation of local communities is limited and is also characterised by the control over activities by donor agencies. Behind the term partnership even with the use of terms such as "partnership" and "ownership", lies the exercise of power over local actors as they do not have control of the activities to be implemented. It is contrary to the so-called "genuine approach" which the author considers that "entails local groups setting the development agenda from the outset and remaining in control throughout" and participation constitutes an end in itself.

Linking the Crawford's (2003) consideration and the interviews mentioned above I consider that the CBOs have a minimal participation in the process by virtue of the fact that the NGOs normally bring the general project already designed and the CBOs design their annual activities plan in accordance to what the general project advocates. It suggests that in terms of decision making it is the NGOs who influence what activities are going to be implemented.

Even considering that are the CBOs who choose the activities, these activities must be in accordance with what is said in the general project. It leads me to think of the possibilities of a minimal space for CBOs to influence the process.

My view regarding community participation is that as an effort to invert the "top down" model of development projects implementation I consider that the NGOs and CBOs are trying to bring to the communities the decisions regarding their own development. Nevertheless, the process of community participation itself is too "sensitive" and "slippery" what provokes some doubts about the possibility of the efficiency of the process.

Heek (1999) and Kapoor (2002) argue that the process is not as efficient as it appears given the interference of people external to the process. Still, the decisions that are made reflect the interests of the NGOs. And there is still scepticism about the representativeness of the people who participate in the process as they are normally part of the most influential groups, wherein the marginalised groups are excluded. Still, the authors call attention to the role of the facilitators and the example above shows that the way the facilitators guide the process may influence the discussion; also the selection of the priorities depends on the availability of funds and the activity area and the interest , as the examples above show. At the end the decision that are made and presented as the product of the participative process constitute a symbiosis between the local and external elements. And according to one of the statements above, the external elements exceed the decision making powers of the local NGO, since the final decision is taken at the international level. At the end, what the community does is to legitimise the process as it confirms Simanowitz's (1997: 128) position that community participation relates to the involvement of a community in externally initiated development interventions. That is, external organisations initiate a project and the community participates to legitimise it.

Considering that people who participate bring to the discussion the concerns of the community and take back the results; and observing that the NGOs consider that they can ensure the inclusion of the community's wishes, even without community participation because they have already worked in some places, these facts call to mind the so-called "myth of homogeneity of communities", wherein communities are understood as cohesive units, stable and static (Negrão 1997). However, communities are not cohesive; there are

differences based on the social positions that people occupy, sex and age among other differences. It means that opinions and needs may vary, let alone the fact that their priorities can change throughout time.

#### 4.3.4.1 The question of ownership and community participation

The issues of community participation in decision-making about the process of project design and activities implementation also leads to problems related to the ownership of the project whether by the CBOs or by the communities. Addressing the issue of ownership in this specific study is relevant as it shows at what extent the communities and the CBOs consider themselves the "owners" of the projects in practical terms, as it is said institutionally. It also shows at what extent the way the NGOs guide the process in practical terms put the communities as the leaders of their own development.

Regarding the issue of ownership the findings showed that there are some situations that show lack of ownership of the projects by the communities and by the CBOs. Usually the respondents of the CBOs refer to the projects as being the NGOs projects and consider that they are only implementing them. The script illustrate this: *"I consider that they are the owners of the project because they bring the project already designed and tell us what we have to do. They determine what is to be done. Because if they came and sat with us asking what are our priorities we would tell them about our priorities".* (Interview, R-CBO1-02, 23rd November 2013).

However the greater influence of the NGOs, the CBOs indicates that there is some space for "negotiation", especially throughout the phase of activities implementation. For instance if during the activities implementation they realise that there is a need to add another activity which was not initially predicted, they can add. Though it has to be in accordance with what is stated in the general project in terms of the general thematic area. The introduced activity cannot go out from the general themes stated in the project. Though, it can only be done under NGOs' authorisation.

These forms of negotiation can be framed on what Chatterjee (2004: 77-78) calls "popular sovereignty", which advocate that people can choose how they should be governed forcing

their governors to learn, how they would prefer to be governed. Despite the fact that here the study is not about popular resistance but about organizations, the strategies adopted by the CBOs can be understood as the way the CBOs show their partners and negotiate how they want the activities to be implemented.

The success of the negotiation depends on the existing "spaces of manoeuvre" within the project and the CBOs skills to convince the NGOs about the importance of the activity they desire to add to the annual plan. The CBOs were unanimous in stating that, concerning matters related to "money issues" the NGOs are most unlikely to allow any kind of "negotiation" especially when it comes to increments in salaries, bonuses and subsidies, or other CBOs organisational needs.

## 4.4 Roles and Responsibilities within the partnership

This section aims to address the roles and responsibilities of the NGOs and CBOs within the partnership. It is important to mention that it will be based on the way they perceive their own contribution and how they understand the contribution of the NGOs.

### 4.4.1 Analysing Discourses behind the NGOs and CBOs understanding of their Roles and Responsibilities

According to the gathered data, through interviews, there is a tendency to look at the NGOs as responsible for "transferring" knowledge and bringing about changes in both the community and CBOs. The CBOs in turn have the role to "receive" and comply with the requirements as conveyed in the contract and the guidelines to the NGOs to move forward and facilitate "changes". This way of understanding the roles and responsibilities between the CBOs and NGOs can be analysed taking into account the construction of development discourses. In this setting, we see a dichotomous relationship emerging, wherein the NGOs are the "providers" and the CBOs are the "recipients". Herein therefore, the CBOs are constructed as lacking in knowledge, and the NGOs are constructed as possessing knowledge. The NGOs must transfer the knowledge to the CBOs in order to create changes to both the CBOs and the communities. This structure reveals the power relations imbued in the

partnerships. This power determines the kind of relationship NGOs and CBOs will have in practical terms.

The way NGOs and CBOs interpret their roles and responsibilities are implicit strategies of power and control to ensure that the guidelines toward "help", "change" and "improvement" and "learning" are being implemented. For example the regular monitoring of activities, training in accounting and programmatic procedures, allocation of advisors to the CBOs are also meant to be ways to ensure that the guidelines and orientations advocated in the contract are being met.

The following excerpt from an interview will illustrate this practice:

*"Every year, even in our day-to-day meetings with the donors, which we call trainings, all our partners have to nominate their accountants and project co-ordinators, depending on the organisation'(...) structure to come and participate in the training,* ***especially because for us that is infallible. We do not want them to see things in their own way and then come here to say "Oh, I did not know." First we provide the trainings even before we start the disbursement of funds.*** *For us it is crucial. What the training is basically about? We pass the procedures to the partners. There are those which are the basics that everyone needs to know whether it is this or that donor. (...) So it's one of the things that we always go to the partners.* ***And then we also have our day-to-day, what we call the monitoring visits. So, this is also a means we use to make the transfer (of procedures).*** *These are also procedures required by our donors. So in those cases with very strict and rigid donors we also have our local co-ordinators there. The co-ordinator is very near to the partner, and he also has this knowledge mainly on what are the specific requirements of the donor".* (Interview, R-NGO1-05, 24th January 2013, the emphasis is mine).

The excerpt above illustrates how in development discourse the logic behind role of monitoring and training meant to strengthen the CBOs capacity building is also a way of "knowledge transfer". Monitoring and trainings can also be seen as strategies of controlling to ensure that the CBOs are not performing out of the contract.

### 4.4.2 Strategies of Power, Control, Resistance and Counter-Power

Control is thus, an essential element of strategic alliances and constitutes a process of regulation and monitoring for the achievement of organisational goals. Control plays the role of checking and making sure that the activities are being carried out according to plan (Das and Teng 2001).

The NGOs provide capacity building to the CBOs with the aim of strengthening their institutional capacity that the CBOs will become sustainable. Also in order to ensure that the CBOs are acting adequately the NGOs organize training, visits of monitoring and evaluation. It is also meant to ensure that the CBOs performance are being in accordance to what is advocated in the contracts and that the CBOs behaviour will not get the NGO in conflict with the donor who provided money for that specific project. The NGOs also can allocate an expertise or hiring an individual to help the CBOs in a specific area either programmatic or financial.

Nevertheless, the data indicated that probably the CBOs sometimes don't understand the importance of these strategies used by the NGOs at the same level that the NGOs do. The NGOs indicated that sometimes the CBOs show some resistance to accept some of these standards even when the contract advocates it.

As example, the fact that the CBOs do not contract qualified personnel especially in the financial area; the fact that they show a relative resistance in receiving NGOs personnel to assist them is understood by the NGOs as a way to take advantage of the "disorganized accountancy". The use of the "I did not know excuse" is also another strategy that NGOs understand as a strategy for non-compliance with certain guidelines.

Still another respondent indicated that it is common for CBOs not to meet certain guidelines passed in the training on "donor financial procedures" and show indignation illustrated by complaints such as: *"why, are you giving me so much work?* And *"why all these procedures"*? And *"these procedures are difficult and complicated. Why do I have to do so much work"*? [The examples were withdrawn from the interview with R-NGO1-05, 24th January 2013).

Some considerations can be made looking at these expressions as a form of indignation. They can illustrate that: there is a gap or a different perception of what the NGOs say they want to achieve (sustainability, professional training), through capacity building and how it is perceived by the CBOs; or rather, the CBOs probably do not understand the importance of these aspects the same way that the NGOs understand them; or yet, the CBOs and as a result of the aspects considered before, do not want the changes and develop some strategies to escape from them. It is in relation to all of these elements that I consider them strategies of resistance and counter-power. As, "it brings to mind images of domineering implementers forcing unwanted changes on stakeholders who are fearful and reticent to alter familiar practices (just because change is uncomfortable and/or "everyone hate changes") and thus rebel" (Lewis 2011).

**Strategies of Counter-power and Resistance**

The concept of counter-power is important in this study as it rejects the view that "effective campaigners must simply engage with power as it is, seize power, or form alliances with the powerful" and reinforce the idea of "perpetual redistribution of power from the haves to the have-nots". The concept is also associated with Dahl's notion of power understood as "influence". Within this notion of power counter-power is thus "the ability of B to remove the power of A" and to undermine the power of illegitimate elites (Gee and Lewis, n.d).

Greenstein (2003a) also gives evidences of the 3 dimensions of power (social, institutional and discursive) and argues that the notion of power has a discursive and a practical side. Thus, power is something that can be exercised by various actors in different ways depending on interests, position at a given time. In so doing, the adoption of strategies of resistance by the CBOs may be seen as an exercise of discursive power as the strategies are not institutionally recognised.

The strategies adopted by the NGOs to ensure that the CBOs are performing in accordance to the contract, such as the provision of trainings, monitoring visits, drawn up also with the aim of strengthening the capacity of CBOs may not always be understood the same way by the CBOs and they will adopt different strategies of resistance. Similar evidence of "perverse effects" was also found by (Naidoo 2010), in a study entitled "The feminisation of poverty"

as disabling discourse. The author shows that the existence of a Child Social Grant (CSG), provided by the government meant to help people in need, was being interpreted by the people who participated in the study as the cause of teenage pregnancy.

In their turn the CBOs also indicated some strategies they adopt in order to minimise the risk of offending the NGOs maximising at the same time their relationship. It suggests that the CBOs are aware that acting differently from what the NGO recommends them can undermine the relationship.

It is important to dwell on the fact that all of the CBOs that participated in this study rely majorly on external financial support to deliver services to their communities and to maintain their organisations. Though, some run activities on a small income for generations, as they have mentioned the income they receive is not enough to respond to the demand. They use the income generated to respond to their institutional needs, and to the beneficiaries' needs which are not covered by the project. Then, using their own funds the CBOs avoid misusage of money what can undermine their partnership with the NGO.

There is another strategy that the CBOs also use, which has to do with the *"quasi-misusage of money"* in a way that it will not affect the prior activity plan agreed with the NGO. The CBO will use the money provided for an activity to tackle an immediate situation which is not covered in the activity plan and normally it is very similar to the planed activity, so it will not affect negatively the project results. Acting in this way, they avoid conflicts with the NGOs while at the same time address their immediate interests and needs.

What I understood is that capacity building is at the same time a way of "transferring knowledge", transferring donors or NGOs financial and programmatic procedures, through trainings, monitoring and evaluation visits, concomitantly it constitutes also a way of controlling in order to minimise the existent risk in the partnership. Though despite the use of these strategies by the NGOs the CBOs are not passive they also adopt strategies of escaping control, which can be seen as forms by which they try to negotiate their space of power in order to accommodate their own interests.

## 4.5 Interaction between NGOs and CBOs within the partnership

In this section I aim to describe and analyse the interaction between NGOs and CBOs starting with the significance and benefits of the partnership for both. I will also bring up how the NGOs and CBOs understand the concept of partnership; how they see their partners and themselves within the partnership; and what expectations they have in relation to their partners. I will also look at what strategies both use in order to maximise the relationship.

### 4.5.1 Significance of partnership

The term partnership is understood by both NGOs and CBOs as a relationship characterised by collaboration, mutual assistance, help, sharing and trust, where the partners know each other very well, and can communicate. The CBO added that a "good partnership" is one where dialogue and communication are present, especially where both partners can sit and evaluate together the implementation of activities.

The way NGOs and CBOs understand the concept of partnership is similar to the way Silva (2005: 42), defines it. The author gives relevance to aspects such as: co-operation, sharing of the same vision, good communication, exchange of information, resources and experience, mutual understanding of the weaknesses of each party, mutual commitment to long-term, mutual benefit (direct: training, funds or personal or indirect: professional or personal satisfaction).

The CBOs consider that some of these elements are present in their partnership with the NGOs but, in general their partnership lacks them. They consider that in most cases the dialogue is deficient. One respondent put it in these terms: *"For me a good partner is the one who knows his partner and maintain a good communication; and not a partner who will only come for auditing. This semester we only communicated once with our partner. Sometimes we only communicate at the end of the year in the phase of activities planning".* (Interview, R-CBO3-04, 4th January 2013).

Communication is an important element within a partnership as it allows a greater interaction between partners. According to Mawdsley *et al* (2005), greater interaction helps in improving

dialogue between partners and the partners will be in a better position to discuss and understand each other. It also helps in stimulating a closer and more respectful partnership. Face-to-face partnership facilitates a depth relation unlike emails, letters and faxes.

In their turn the NGOs also reinforced that a good partnership is the one whose partners are interested in improving their performance, opt for good accountability and transparency and are opened to learn and receive knowledge.

According to the NGOs that participated in the study, they have considerable examples of good partners however some of them show problems related to misusage of money and do not reach the expected targets in time. The NGOs mentioned that: "*At times we disburse funds but the planned activities for that period are not entirety carried out. We see the use of some funds for something else that was not planned*". (Interview, R-NGO1-01, 21st January 2013).

Another respondent also from a NGO said: "*We have problems related to misusage of money because most of the CBOs depend exclusively on that money* (provided by the NGO), *then they think they have found a solution for all their problems. Then, when we follow the process of monitoring we realise that the planned activities are not being implemented efficiently.* And *the money has been used for other activities* which **were not planned**". (Interview, R-NGO2-01, 23rd January 2013, the emphasis is mine).

Regarding the concept of partnership the CBOs give more value to the issue of the relationship itself as they care more about aspects related to lack of communication and dialogue. In their turn the NGOs seem to be more inclined to the institutional issues, to the organisational process itself including the financial issues and activities implementation.

### 4.5.2 Significance of partnership: Benefits and gains

The CBOs have identified the different benefits that they get through partnership with the NGOs, which are: improvement of their institutional condition through the acquisition of offices (own or rented), cars, salaries and subsidies, various trainings that they participate. They also stated that through government and community recognition the CBOs and the

members get prestige in the community and personal satisfaction for being recognised as "the saviours" of the community.

In terms of organisational gains they also pointed out that having a partnership with NGOs represents a way to get money and guarantee the operability of the CBO as most of the CBOs do not have any other ways to continue their activities if not through partnership with the NGOs. Partnership is also seen as a way to enrich the CBOs network and get jobs for other CBOs' members.

The CBOs referred to this aspect as follow: "*if the partnership ends now, we will become inactive. The income generation activities that we run out are not enough to tackle our needs and the needs in the communities. There is a part of activities that we can continue, but the bulk part is sorted out by external funds and we depend mostly on their money*". (Interview, R-CBO1-02, 23rd November 2012).

In another interview, another respondent said: "*Money is what preoccupies me now because I need it to undertake the activities and to maintain the organization*". (R-CBO2-01, 20th November 2012). The respondent also pointed out that having a partnership with a NGO can also constitute a way of maximising their networks within civil society as they are aware that if they perform adequately they can maintain a last long relationship with the NGO and it can also open other opportunities to establish partnerships with various NGOs.

The CBOs have an important role within the relationship as they contribute to the partnership with their work with the communities and the communities are an important element for the success of the projects. One respondent described the contribution of the CBOs in these terms: "we *contribute to the partnership because we also sell their "fish"*[25]; *we help them to get more money and credibility from the donors, because we now that they also rely on the donors to get money for their projects. And if we implement well the activities it is a gain for the NGOs. We also elevate the NGOs' work. We also give them our experience*". (Interview, R-OCB1-01, 20th November 2012).

[25] The term fish is used here in a figurative sense of the term, which in the local language means that the CBOs understand that implementing activities in partnership with a given NGO, means they are also doing part of NGOs' work, as they also have an interest in it.

Another respondent also said: *"We give them our potential, our talent and all these make the NGOs grow up and become recognised for their work because we do the work with the communities"*. (Interview, R-CBO3-03, 4th January 2013).

For NGOs having partnership with CBOs means a way to create sustainability and effectiveness of their actions, ensuring that the projects will respond to the needs of the beneficiaries, transferring knowledge to the communities and achieving more impact as people are organised in groups. Also, they mentioned that working in partnership with local CBOs means, a reduction of the costs of implementation and saving of time as they do not have to deal with the whole project circle. In financial terms having partnership with CBO means costs retention to the NGOs, as they do not have to deal with administrative expenses, such as salaries, offices just to mention some.

The NGOs also consider that the CBOs through their work also contribute to the growing of the NGOs in terms of experience given to them and also help the NGOs to achieve their goals and reach their vision. They also complement the NGOs activities, as many times the CBOs implement activities in places that the NGOs are not physically present.

This indicates that in terms of gains and benefits both sides benefit from the partnership even though the partnership does not meet their expectations considering their concept of "good partnership".

### 4.5.3 The Relation between Risk and incentives within the partnership between NGOs and CBOs

Das and Teng (2001: 253-254) distinguish two types of risk namely: relational and performance risk. And both are linked to the uncertainties prevailing in strategic alliances such as the partnerships between NGOs and CBOs. Relational risk has to do with the probability and the consequences of an unsatisfactory co-operation resulting from the opportunistic behaviour of both partners (e.g. shirking, cheating, distorting information, etc). The conflicts arise because each partner has its own interests which may differ from the interests of the other partner. Performance risk is related to new entrants, demand fluctuation,

change in government policies, and lack competence of the partners, firms and sheer bad luck. These factors contribute to non-compliance with the objectives set in the alliance.

In Eiseinhardt's (1989) words, relational risk arises when the principal and agent have different attitudes toward risk as a result of different interests while performance risk is related to the organisational and institutional issues and it is related to the future. The future can bring prosperity, bankruptcy, or some intermediate outcome.

The NGOs stated that they are aware of the potential risk which exists in their partnerships with the CBOs especially when it has to do with funds transfer, especially if the CBOs are new partners without much experience.

Another potential risk mentioned by the NGOs has to do with the tendency of the CBOs to work with many partners at the same time considering the limited capacity of the CBOs in terms of human resources. According to one respondent of a NGO working in partnership with many partners can reduce the CBOs' capacity of presenting good results and meeting deadlines. The respondent stated the following: *"Sometimes the CBOs are not honest. They always do accept more contracts with the new partners even knowing that they do not have capacity to accomplish all the activities fully as expected"*. (R-NGO1-3 22nd January 2013). It can be considered a relational risk, as it has to do with lack of honesty by the CBO.

It should be noted that the risk can also arise from the NGOs' side when due to various reasons they have to stop funding a given project which is already running. Das and Teng (2001) consider it as a performance risk, as it has to do with the future, which can change and it is out of control of the NGOs.

The CBOs are also aware of this risk in implementing activities with the NGOs and they considered that it represents a severe risk, to the extent that it can affect the CBOs' relationship with the beneficiaries of the project.

According to Bloom and Milkovich (1997) "one of the essential features of agency theory is its predictions relating to firm performance on the use of incentive pay" (Baiman 1990, Eisenhardt 1989, Jensen & Murphy 1990, cited by Bloom and Milkovich 1997). Nevertheless

the authors consider that there is a negative relationship between risk, incentive compensation and firm performance.

For the purpose of this study I will be paying attention to the centrality of the notion of risk and incentives in agency theory, seeing incentives as a mean used by the principal seeking to reduce the risk and improve the agents' performance. Both NGOs mentioned that they use incentives in order to improve the performance of the CBOs toward the achievement of good results and accomplish what is advocated in the contracts or memoranda of understanding. In other words the use of incentives is meant to reduce the risk inherent in the partnership. The forms of incentives mentioned are: honorable mention[26] and public recognition[27].

The attribution of Honorable Mention is meant to recognise and reward the "partners who engage in the struggle for human rights at various levels of society in order to create change in the lives of people living in poverty and exclusion". And the main objective is:

"*To encourage and reward who engage in reciprocity and co-operation for the implementation of the strategic objectives enshrined in the strategic priorities of AAMOZ and partners, creating change, proposing and implementing sustainable alternatives in the lives of people living in poverty and the attitude and behaviour of the subjects of obligations (decision makers, with special attention to the government)*" (ActionAid 2012[28]).

And public recognition is meant to extol the qualities and effort of partners who have demonstrated "good practices" in the implementation of project activities. "*Praising the effort of the partners in the presence of other CBOs makes others also strive to improve their performance*". (Interview, R-NGO2-01, 23rd January 2013). The public recognition is made during the meetings of partners that are held periodically at the NGO organisation.

[26] AAMOZ has institutionalised the Honorable Mention as a form to incentive their partners;
[27] FDC incentive their partners through public recognition;
[28] Termos de Referencia para a Menção Honrosa.

### 4.5.4 Points of disagreements and potential conflicts

Conflict constitutes a form of interaction understood as "disagreement or friction that occurs when the actions or beliefs of one or more members of the team are unacceptable to and resisted by at least another member of the group" (Forsyth 1999: 236).

The CBOs pointed out that one of the most frequent locus of conflict has to do with the money issue, either the delay in disbursement or its insufficiency; and by the fact that the money made available from the NGOs sometimes do not contemplate offices expenses (stationery, rent), salaries and subsidies for people who implement the activities and thus, they must make a very large "gym"[29] in order to get money for salaries and other office expenses. They also considered that the NGOs are too rigid regarding money issues.

The NGOs also indicated that misusage of money constitutes one of the most frequent conflicts and it is one of the most determinant elements for breaking of a partnership and constitutes one of the weaknesses of the CBOs.

The allocation[30] of people in the areas of accountancy and administration, a strategy used by the NGOs to ensure a greater performance and straightening of CBOs' capacity building in either financial or programmatic areas constitute another focus of conflict according to the CBOs. And sometimes it is understood as an interference of external people in CBOs' internal issues.

Regarding this issue a respondent of CBO3, shared an experience which culminated in a severe internal crisis wherein the CBOs ended up experiencing the withdrawal of funding and all partners. The respondent said: "*External people were the cause of the crisis. They made themselves the owners of the organisation because they were brought by the donor. The time we had hired people working with us* (one accountant and one adviser allocated by the NGOs

[29] The expression used to say that it is difficult for them to deal with this issue and they have to work hard in order to overcome it.

[30] Normally, the NGOs hire people to deal especially with the project they are funding when the CBO doesn't have a specialist in that area or if they consider that the person allocated to the area is not qualified. Within the team of workers in the CBOs it is frequent to find that the programmatic areas are being run by members of the CBOs, but finance and administration is someone hired and paid to execute that specific project. If not, the NGOs allocate "advisers", "mentors".

partners at that time) *they wanted to take control over the organisation. It ended up creating disturbances. We had problems with the NGO and with our members because the activities weren't being implemented as planned but the money was being used by someone who doesn't belong to organisation and the activities were still there to be done. Therefore, the NGO decided to break the contract and other partners also decided to do the same. It was our best moment in terms of projects but things ended up like that and up to now we are facing problems to get partners to fund our projects".* (Interview, R-CBO3-04, 4th January 2013).

This extract of interview may also show how different is the understanding between NGOs and CBOs regarding the objectives used in order to improve the CBO's capacity building, on the one hand. On the other it can evidence that some strategies used by NGOs to provide capacity building are perceived as interference in the internal structure of CBOs and may ultimately cause conflict within the CBOs and between the CBOs and NGOs. It is important to consider that the CBOs staff is normally composed by the members and it constitute a private space of the CBOs members, and the entrance of "strangers" can constitute a threat to the CBOs' integrity, and it explains the reason for resistance. The conflict here may be seen as "side effects"[31] "adverse sides" or "unintended consequences". It also shows how the CBOs are closed up in accepting external people within their organisations (Fergusson 1990).

[31] The notion of "effect sides" is used by James Ferguson in his Book, "The anti-politics Machine: development and Bureaucratic power in Lesotho, to show how some development interventions meant to reach some goals they end up causing different results from those they were meant for.

# Chapter 5: Conclusions

The establishment of a partnership between NGOs and CBOs is determined by geographical area, activities area, sharing of objectives, mutual knowledge and trust. Though, trust appears as the most determinant element. The decision-making process within the partnership between NGOs and CBOs about the establishment of the partnership is influenced by the rationality and subjectivity where personal opinions and interests are also present. The NGOs have more influence in decision-making process within the relationship. However, the CBOs also influence the process by adopting different strategies to attract their partners and also by strategies of negotiation and resistance. It signifies that the CBOs are not passive in the process of establishing partnership they also influence it what can be seen as a mean of exercise of power.

Both, NGOs and CBOs contribute and gain from the partnerships they establish and what constitute the basis of complementarities are the differences between them. The NGOs participate in the partnership with funding, information, access to sources of funding and decision-making, whereas the CBOs participate with their work, experience, proximity to the communities, including community leaders. For CBOs the establishment of partnership with NGOs signifies institutional and professional growth, sustainability, job opportunities for more members of the organisation and prestige in the community. For NGOs partnership signifies reduction of administrative costs, ensuring sustainability and scaling of their activities. It means that both partners participate, contribute and benefits from the partnership.

Despite being a beneficial relationship for both partners, it is also a relationship of disagreements and conflicts derived from the difference of interests and understanding about some attitudes of both parties, where the financial issue is the major locus of conflict and constitutes the major reason for breaking of the partnership.

The relationship also involves a potential risk and the NGOs adopt some strategies meant to reduce the risk and controlling to ensure that the CBOs perform in accordance to what the contract advocates. The CBOs also adopt strategies to escape the NGOs controlling. In this sense the NGOs develop control strategies and incentives for risk reduction.

In conclusion, despite the differences, potential risk, conflicts of interest, disagreements and differences in terms of resources, the partnership between NGOs and CBOs is based on complementarities, mutual recognition of the contributions and value of each partner. It is also a partnership wherein both exercise power; though from different dimension and nature, wherein the NGOs exercise institutional and discursive power and the CBOs exercise symbolic power as they influence the process.

# Bibliography


ActionAid. Termos de Referencia para Menção Honrosa

ActionAid. Memorando de Entendimento sobre Implementação Conjunta do Programa Local de Direitos. Mocuba-Lugela PLD8. Maputo.

ActionAid. (2011). ActionAid Mozambique Country Strategy 2012-2017: Accelerating People's Rights to a Life of Dignity. Maputo.

Adam, Y. (1997). Evolução das Estratégias para o Desenvolvimento no Moçambique Pós-colonial Moçambique: Perspectivas sobre a Ajuda e o Sector Civil. Amsterdam: GdM.

Araujo, C., *at al.* (2008). Estudo de caso. Universidade do Minho – Instituto de Educação e Psicologia.

Assembleia da República. 1991. Lei nº 8/911, de 18 de Julho. Maputo.

Bloom, M., and Milkovich, G. T. (1997). Relationship between Risk, Incentive Pay, and Organisational Performance. Academy of Management Journal, 41(3), 283-297.

Bourdieu, P., (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: The Eltan Burgos School of Economics.

Bonamino, A. *et al.* (2010). Os Efeitos das Diferentes Formas de Capital no Desempenho Escolar: Um estudo à Luz de Bourdieu e Coleman. Franco, C.; Bonamino, A. (coords.). Eficácia e Eqüidade na Escola Fundamental Brasileira. Relatório Final apresentado ao Fondo de Investigaciones Educativas/PREAL–Gdn.

Burman, E. (2003). Discourse analysis means analysing discourse: Some comments on Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter 'Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings'. Discourse analysis online, 1(2). http://axtra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003-t.html

Bryman, A. (1996). Social Research Strategies. In Bryman A, *Social Research Methods* 2nd ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford .

Chatterjee, P. (2004). The politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chechetto-Salles, M., and Geyer, Y. (2006). Community-Based Organisation Management. Pretoria: Idasa.

Christie, I. (1996). Samora: Uma Biografia. Ndjira.

Crawford, G. (2003). Partnership or Power? Deconstructing the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia. Third World Quarterly, 24(1), 139-159.

Da Conceição G. V. (1993). NGOs and Promotion of Self-employment in Post War Development in Mozambique (Doctoral dissertation, University College of Swansea).

Dahl, R. (1976). Modern Political Analysis. Yale University.

Das, T. K., and Teng, B. S. (1998). Between Trust and Control: Developing Confidence in Partner Cooperation in Alliances. Academy of management review, 491-512.

Das, T. K., and Teng, B. S. (1999). Cognitive Biases and Strategic Decision processes: An Integrative Perspective. Journal of Management Studies, 36(6), 757-778.

Das, T. K., and Teng, B. S. (2001). Trust, Control, and Risk in Strategic alliances: An Integrated Framework. Organization Studies, 22(2), 251-283.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review. Academy of management review, 57-74.

FDC. (2007). Índice da Sociedade Civil em Moçambique. A Sociedade Civil Moçambicana por dentro: Avaliação, Desafios, Oportunidades e Acção.

FDC. Contracto de Prestação de Serviços N.o 10.SUB/FDC-PK/08.

Ferguson, J. (1990). The Anti-Politics Machine: "development", depoliticization and bureaucratic power in Lesotho. Cambridge University Press.

Fowler, A. (1990). Building Partnerships between Northern and Southern Development NGOs: Issues for the 1990s. Development in Practice, 1(1), 5-18.

Forsyth, D. R. (1999). Group Dynamics. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Fumo, C. (1995). ONG's Moçambicanas: Sua Identidade e Papel no Desenvolvimento do País. Maputo: CEA.

Fritz, V., & Menocal, A. R. (2006). (Re) building Developmental States: From Theory to Practice. Overseas development institute (ODI).

Gee, T. and Lewis, E. Building Counter power. Assessed 11st March 2013 (http://www.newleftproject.org/index.php/site/article_comments/building_counterpower.

Giddens, A. (1991). The Consequences of Modernity. California: Stanford University Press.

Greenstein, R. (2003a). State, Civil Society and the Reconfiguration of Power in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Centre for Civil Society.

Greenstein, R. (2003b). Social Research: A Study in Methods of Gathering Data. New York: Longmans.

Habib, A. (2005). State-civil Society Relations in Post-apartheid South Africa. Social Research: An International Quarterly, 72(3), 671-692.

Hanlon, J. (1997a). O dono de Moçambique é o FMI. Moçambique: Perspectivas sobre a Ajuda e o Sector Civil. Amsterdão: GdM.

Halon, J. (1997b). Paz sem Benefício: Como o FMI Bloqueia a Reconstrução de Moçambique. Centro de Estudos Africanos, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610(1), 21-44.

Heek, R. (1999). The Tyranny of Participation in Information Systems: Learning from Development Projects. Working paper series, no.4. Institute for Development Policies and Management.

Henning, E. *et al.* (2004). Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research. Van Schaik publishers.

José, A. C. (2005). Neoliberalism e Crise do Trabalho em Moçambique: O Caso da Industria e Caju. O cabo dos trabalhos: Revista electronica dos trabalhos de Mestrado e Doutoramento do CES/FEUC/FLUC, N0.1.

José, A., and Monteiro, A. (1995). ONG's: Faces e Contra Faces na Identidade Civil Moçambicana. Maputo: Centro de Estudos Africanos.

Kamat, S. (2004). The Privatization of Public Interest: Theorizing NGO Discourse in a Neoliberal Era. Review of International Political Economy, 11(1), 155-176.

Kapoor, I. (2002). The Devil's in the Theory: A Critical Assessment of Robert Chambers' Work on Participatory Development. Third World Quarterly, 23(1), 101-117.

Letia, I. A., and Slavescu, (n.d). Decision Making Based on Trust and Reputation in Ecommerce.

Lewis, D. (2009). Non-Governmental Organizations, Definition and History. School of Economics and Political Science. London. http://personal.lse.ac.uk/lewisd/images/encylciv%20societyngos2009-dl.pdf. Assessed on 23rd January 2013

Lewis, L. K. (2011). Organizational Change: Creating Change through Strategic Communication. Wiley-Blackwell.

Lunenburg, P. C. (2010). The Decision-Making Process. In National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal. Vol. 27, No.4, 1-12.

Mansouri, G., and Rao, V. (2003). Evaluating, Community-Based and Community-Driven development: A critical review of the evidence. Washington DC: Development Research Group, World Bank.

Malhotra, K. (2000). NGOs without Aid: Beyond the Global Soup Kitchen. Third World Quarterly, 21(4), 655-668.

Manji, F., and O'Coill, C. (2002). The Missionary Position: NGOs and Development in Africa. International Affairs, 78(3), 567-583.

Mawdsley, E. *et al.* (2005). Trust, Accountability, and Face-to-Face Interaction in North–South NGO Relations. Development in Practice, 15(1), 77-82.

Miller, J. L. (2002). The Board as a Monitor of Organizational Activity: The Applicability of Agency Theory to Nonprofits Boards. Nonprofits Management and Leadership, 12(4), 429-450.

Naidoo, P. (2010) "The Feminisation of Poverty" as Disabling Discourse. Zuma's Own Goal. Eds. Bond, P. Desai, A .and Maharaj, B. Africa World Press: Eritreia, 171-190.

Negrão, J. (1997). Repensando as Modas do Desenvolvimento Rural. Moçambique: Perspectivas sobre a Ajuda e o sector civil, Amsterdão: GdM, 123.

Ndlovu, N. (2004). The Cinderellas of Development? Funding CBOs in South Africa. Interfund.

Silva, T. (1995). Visão de Parceria na Base: Contribuição para um Debate. Maputo: Centro de Estudos Africanos.

Simanowitz, A. (1997). Water and Sanitation for all: Partnerships and Innovations. In Proceedings from the 23rd WEDC Conference: Community participation/Community-Driven. South Africa: Durban.

Siisiainen, M. (2003). Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam. International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, 40(2), 183-204.

Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Symes, C. (2002). The New Toolbox for Community Based Organisations. Vol 1, Community Based Organisations. Port Elizabeth: Barnabas Trust, DFID and Ministry of Health.

Turpin, S. M., and Marais, M. A. (2004). Decision-making: Theory and practice.

Thomas, S. (1992). Sustainability in NGO Relief and Development Work: Further Thoughts from Mozambique. Development in Practice, 2(1), 37-46.

Virton, P. (1966). Os Dinamismos Sociais. Iniciação à sociologia. Lisboa: Livraria Morais Editora.

Weiss, R. S. (1995). Learning from strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies. Simon and Schuster.

Wignara, P. (1989). Ten years of Experience with Participatory Action Research in South Asia- Lessons for NGOs and People's Organizations. Eartac and CUSO. 30-40.

Williams, G. (2004). Evaluating Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power and (Re) Politicisation. Third world quarterly 25(3), 557-578.

# Appendixes

## Ethics Information Sheet

**Research Title: The relationship between Non-Governmental Organisations and Community-Based Organisations in implementing development projects in Mozambique**

My name is Nárcya Chilengue, I am a Masters Student of Development Studies at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. As part of the evaluation process I am undertaking a research to reflect on the partnership between the Non-Governmental Organisations that provide funding and the CBOs that implement the activities in the communities. I have selected one national and one international NGO and four CBOs. For the purposes of my study I am interested in understanding aspects related to the relationship between the partners, the planned activities implementation, the project design and the decision-making process and development of the partnership. In this regard, I will need to interview people who deal with the areas mentioned above.

I will also need to use documental analysis and participatory observations. The documents that I will need are: the strategic plans, reports of the various activities, memoranda of understanding and the minutes of meetings. Participatory observation will consist in attending some meetings regarding the main discussions and issues related to decision making on the various activities being implemented.

I would like to ensure that anonymity and confidentiality will be guaranteed. In this sense I will not share the information provided with internal or external people from the organisations and I will not disclose the name of the organisation or the name of the respondent who gave information. In the research report the names (organisations and respondents), will be coded in a way that ensures it will not be possible to know who had provided particular information apart from myself and my supervisor. The original names of respondents will be made accessible only to my supervisor and me. I will also inform all participants that their participation in the research is voluntary and the interviewee or organisation is free to withdraw them/itself from the research at any time, should they decide not to continue.

This research and all aspects related to it are the responsibility of the student and all the issues to it, therefore any onus howsoever arising will be placed on her. Participation in the interviews is voluntary and is not done with the expectation of any kind of compensation for providing information. However, I promise to interact with all participants as partners and as important contributors to my research, and will at all times operate with an attitude of mutual respect and consideration.

Should you have any questions or concerns, related to this research, please feel free to contact me or my supervisor.

*Supervisor contact: Ran Greenstein/email address: ran.greenstein@wits.ac.za*

*Student contact: Nárcya Chilengue/email address; narcyamanjate1@yahoo.com.br/ Cell number: +27 0742817780 (RSA) or +258 829671230 (MOZ).*

## *Permission Form*

**Title of the research: The Relationship between Non-Governmental organizations and Community Based Organizations in implementing development projects in Mozambique.**

This is to certify that[32] _____agrees and allows the researcher, Nárcya Chilengue to undertake her research with this institution. I certify that the institution had access to all relevant information regarding its participation on this research.

The institution confirms that was informed and understands about:

(Please put a tick (√), if you agree and a cross (x) if you disagree.

| | |
|---|---|
| What participation in this research project means | |
| That the participation is voluntary | |
| The objectives and purpose of the research | |
| That the organization has the right to withdraw from the study at any time | |
| That the researcher will guarantee anonymity and confidentiality | |
| That it is not expected any kind of compensation for providing information | |
| That the Researcher with interact with all participants within an attitude of mutual respect and consideration. | |

**Name of the representative:** _____
**Signature:** _____
**Local:** _____**Date:** _____

[32] Name of the Organization

## *Permission form for Recording*[33]

In representation of [34]_____ I allow that the interviews to be undertaken in the ambit of the research *"The relationship between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects in Mozambique"* to be recorded by the researcher Nárcya Chilengue.

I am aware that the information that the organization will provide will be transcript to be analyzed and may or may not be used in the research final report.

Local and Data: _____

Name of the Representative: _____

Signature: _____

[33] This permission form will be used to obtain permission from the NGOs and CBOs. Consent form will be given to the participants as I will not force them to be recorded, even having the authorization from the organization.

[34] Name of the organization

## *Consent form for Recording*[35]

I agree to allow my participation in the interview to be recorded as part of the project research *"The relationship between NGOs and CBOs in implementing development projects in Mozambique"*.

I am aware that the information that I will provide will be transcript to be analyzed and may be or not be used in the research final report.

Local and Data: _____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

[35] The consent form will be signed by each participant in order to ensure that He/She is not being forced by the company to allow the recording.

## Interview Schedule for NGOs

### Introduction

Good (morning or evening, as appropriated). My name is Nárcya Chilengue a Masters student at Wits University in Johannesburg. I am doing my research report in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts (Development Studies) which the topic is: The relationship between Non-Governmental Organisations and Community-Based Organisations in implementing development projects in Mozambique. Thus, I have chosen to work with (the name of the organisation), and you are indicated as one of the personal who deal with the issue of partnership within the organisation. I would like to inform that I have got permission from the organisation to record the interviews, though you have the right to decide if you feel comfortable with it.

I would also like to inform that no one else beside my supervisor and me will have access to the raw information. And your name and the name of your organisation will also be omitted in the report.

You are not obliged to respond all question if you don't feel to do so. And, we can interrupt the interview at any time if you do not want to continue.

Do you have any question before we start the interview? *(If the respondent agrees I will start the interview. And if the respondent agree with recording I will record it and if not I will take notes).*

### Questions

Identification of the Organization

Name of the Organization
National or international
Places of activities implementation
What are the NGO' sources of funding? (not names but in terms of nature: own, international donor, local).

Identification of the respondent

How long have you been working at (name of the organisation)?
What are your main responsibilities?

Partnership

At what extents are your responsibilities within the organisation related to the work of the organisations' partners?
May you please tell me how do you understand the concept of "partnership"?
What types of partnership does the organisation establish with other organisations?
What is the main objective in implementing projects through partners?
What differences do you see in implementing projects through partners and directly?
How many processes of identification of partners do you use? (May you describe each of them)?
May you please describe the process of partner's identification (how the process starts until the establishment of partnership)?
What aspects are taken into account to select a partner? (What are the most decisive aspects)?
What kind of partnership does your organisation establish with the CBOs? (May you please describe each of them)?
What are the NGOs contributions for the partnership with the CBOs?
What are the CBOs contributions to the partnership?
How do you evaluate your partners (CBOs) in terms of their weaknesses and strengths?
How do you describe a good and a bad partnership?
What are the main constraints that the organisation faces in implementing projects through partnership with CBOs?
How can you describe the NGOs' relationship with the CBOs?
What are the main focus of conflict between the NGOs and the CBOs? And how does the NGO manage to overcome it?
How does the organisation ensure that the CBOs will implement the activities in accordance with what the contract advocate?
What are the main causes of breaking of partnership?

Does the NGO use any mechanism as incentive to the CBOs in order to improve their performance? (If yes, how does it work)?

Project Design and Activities Implementation

Can you tell me about the process of project design (who participate? How does the process start? How do you select the participants? And why do you proceed like this? How do you decide what activities are going to be implemented)?
During the project design how are the NGO, the CBOs and the donors' interests integrated?
What are the roles and responsibilities of the CBOs within the process?
What is the role of the community leaders within the process?

Significance of partnership

What does it mean for the NGOs having a partnership with CBOs in terms of gains and significance?

**Acknowledgement**

Would you like to make some considerations of clarify something regarding the interview? *(If yes, the respondent will make some considerations, any question or clarify any other issue in relation to the interview).*

*(If not, I will terminate the interview)*

Thank you for participating in the interview!

## Interview Schedule for CBOs

**Introduction**

Good (morning or evening, as appropriated). My name is Nárcya Chilengue a Masters student at Wits University in Johannesburg. I am doing my research report in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts (Development Studies) which the topic is: The relationship between Non-Governmental Organisations and Community-Based Organisations in implementing development projects in Mozambique. Thus, I have chosen to work with (the name of the organisation), and you are indicated as one of the personnel who deal with the issue of partnership within the organisation. I would like to inform that I have got permission from the organisation to record the interviews, though you have the right to decide if you feel comfortable with it.

I would also like to inform that no one else beside my supervisor and me will have access to the raw data. And your name and the name of the organisation will also be omitted in the report.

You are not obliged to respond all question if you do not feel to do so. And, we can interrupt the interview at any time if you do not want to continue.

Do you have any question before we start the interview? *(If the respondent agrees I will start the interview. And if the respondent agree with recording I will record it and if not I will take notes).*

**Questions**

Identification of the Organization

Name of the Organization
Places of activities implementation
What are the CBO' sources of funding? (Not names but in terms of nature: own, international donor, local).

Identification of the respondent

Are you a member of the association? (If yes, how long have you been a member of the association)?

Partnership

What are your responsibilities in relation to the projects implemented by the CBO?
At what extent are your responsibilities related to the partnership with the NGOs that fund the projects?
May you please tell me how do you understand the concept of "partnership"? What does "partnership" mean for you?
What types of partnership does the CBO establish with other organisations?
How does the CBO identify the NGOs partners? (How the process starts, until the establishment of partnership)?
How many processes of identification of partners do you use? (May you describe each of them)?
Who normally starts the process (NGOs or the CBOs)? Why?
Which of the types of identification of partners gives more probabilities that the partnership will be established?
Within the process of identification of partners what is the role of the CBO? (Decide, negotiate the partnership?)What aspects are taken into account to select a partner? (What are the most decisive aspects)?
What types of partnership the CBO establish with other institutions? (May you please describe me each of them)?
What are the NGO's contributions for the CBO?
What gains and benefits do you achieve or have achieved through partnership with NGOs?
What are the CBOs contributions to the partnership?
Which strategies do you use to attract the NGOs? (Including establishment of partnership, maintenance and calling other NGO's attention).

How do you evaluate your partners (NGOs) in terms of their weaknesses and strengths?

How do you describe a good and a bad partnership?

What are the main constraints that the CBO faces in implementing projects through partnership with CBOs?

How can you describe the CBOs' relationship with the NGOs?

What are the main constraints the CBO faces in implementing projects with the NGOs?

What are the main focus of conflict between the CBO and the NGOs partners? And how does the CBO manage to overcome it?

How does the CBO avoid getting in conflicts with the NGOs partners? (Which strategies are used)?

Have the CBO ever had a conflict with a given NGOs which ended up with the break of the partnership? (If yes, can you please provide more details about it? (Causes, how did it happen? When? Which was the NGOs reaction? What the CBO did in order to minimise the conflict)?

What are the main causes of breaking of partnership?

Project Design and Activities Implementation

Can you tell me about the process of project design (who participate? How the process starts? How do you select the participants? And why do you proceed like this? How do you decide what activities are going to be implemented)?

How the activities to be implemented are decided? (Who decide? When? Based on what?);

During the activities plan design, how are the NGO, the CBOs and the communities' interests integrated?

What is the role of the community leaders within the process?

Significance of partnership

What does it mean for the NGOs having a partnership with CBOs in terms of gains and significance?

What king of gains does the NGO achieve through partnership? (In terms of individual and organizational gains and benefits).

What changes do you identify in the CBO as the result of the partnership with NGOs?

**Acknowledgement**

Would you like to make some considerations of clarify something regarding the interview? *(If yes, the respondent will make some considerations, any question or clarify any other issue in relation to the interview). (If no, I will terminate the interview)*

Thank you for participating in the interview!