

If not for profit,  
for what and how?

S O C I A L  
E N T E R P R I S E

# Collaboration between Private Businesses and Social Enterprises: Investigating Complementarity in the Field of Work Integration

Philippe SEMENOWICZ  
Université Paris-Est, ERUDITE, UPEMLV (Marne-la-Vallée, France)

*EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers, no. LG13-17*

4<sup>th</sup> EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise - Liege, 2013

Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP)  
on Social Enterprise (SOCENT) 2012-2017

and



 **EMES network**



© Philippe Semenowicz 2013. EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers are available on the EMES website ([www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)) and on the SOCENT website ([www.iap-socent.be](http://www.iap-socent.be)). These papers do not undergo any editing process. They are published with the support of the Belgian Science Policy Office, within an Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP) on social enterprise entitled « If not for profit, for what? And how? ».

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to investigate partnerships between private businesses and social enterprises in France. In our case the social enterprise is a 'structure d'insertion par l'activité économique' (SIAE), which is equivalent to a work integration social enterprise (WISE) in English. Despite the fact that both sets of economic actors have been in existence since the beginnings of work integration through economic activity, at first the attitude was one of mutual mistrust. Often the ambition of the original exponents of this type of integration was to create an alternative economy in the face of a prevailing economic model that had shown itself to be dysfunctional. When SIAEs appeared, the initial reaction of private businesses was to rail about having to compete with publicly funded organisations. It is interesting to note that since the end of the last decade, private businesses and SIAEs have reconciled their differences, each for their own reasons. The question therefore has to be asked: how should the collaborative ventures between private businesses and SIAEs be understood in this spirit of reconciliation?

A distinctive characteristic of SIAEs is their concurrent status as either a non profit organisation (NPO) or a profit-making organisation. In consequence, traditional third sector/social economy models seem unsuitable in explaining this type of establishment. As an alternative to these models, we choose to conceptualise an SIAE as a 'social enterprise', in the sense that a social enterprise is not identified by its company statutes, but by its primary objective i.e. the integration into the labour market of people with specific problems at a professional and/or social level. This is in contrast to a 'commercial enterprise', the term we use to describe an organisation whose primary objective is to maximise profit (Stokols & Trivedi, 2011). Once we have clarified the theoretical basis for our investigation i.e. the complementarity of two economic activities, we will use this notion of complementarity to analyse the information gleaned during a case study of an SIAE.

## 2. THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE INVESTIGATION: THE COMPLEMENTARITY OF TWO ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

The primary method for investigating interorganisational relationships in economics is transaction cost economics (TCE). However, it is our belief that the theoretical framework of TCE is not suitable for investigating partnerships between commercial enterprises and social enterprises. TCE is based on the hypothesis that the firm can always choose what to make or buy. This arises from the fact that TCE does not take into account the physical reality of production processes. To a large extent, in TCE the firm still remains very much a black box. This limitation proves to be especially problematic when attempting to investigate relationships between commercial enterprises and social enterprises. As Austin notes: *"Efficiency theory, which emphasizes value creation through combining similar resources and missions to achieve economies of scale or cost savings, seems less applicable to these cross-sector collaborations than to same-sector alliances. Capturing synergies derived from complementarity are more the case in the NPO-business alliances"* (2000, 79). Austin's inclusion of the terms "similar" and "complementarity" would seem to imply the need for an alternative to TCE. The theory advocated by Richardson (1972) is that alternative; it was constructed on the basis of this divergence between similarity and complementarity.

Richardson has two criticisms of neoclassical economics, both of which are equally valid for TCE, despite the fact that they were made before TCE joined the ranks of established economic theory. According to Richardson, on a theoretical level neoclassical economics derives from an entrenched firm/market dichotomy which does not satisfactorily explain the division of labour between the firm and the market. On an empirical level neoclassical economics largely ignores the widespread real phenomenon of inter-firm cooperation. This gap in neoclassical economic theory is related to the assumption that the firm is a production function i.e. the theory does not account for the physical processes of production. It is here that Richardson asserts Penrose's importance in the development of a cognitive approach to the firm (Penrose's work is considered influential in our understanding of a

firm's capabilities). Richardson's theory of the firm draws from this nonstandard paradigm, allowing him to make sense of the phenomena he is endeavouring to explain.

Conversely to TCE, Richardson shifts the focus from industrial transactions to what he refers to as "activities". This notion of *activities* opens the door for him to consider production processes in concrete terms and is the cause of the rift between Richardson's theory and neoclassical economics. Indeed in TCE the firm can always choose what to make or buy. The decision hinges on the minimisation of costs. Richardson disputes this thinking; he believes in the concept of a firm's capabilities, where *capabilities* are the knowledge, skills and experience held by the firm. They determine what the firm is capable or not capable of producing. Moreover, a firm does not always have the capability to undertake a particular activity. Richardson goes on to distinguish between *complementary activities* and *similar activities*. Similar activities are those which require the same capability; complementary activities are those which comprise the same production process. Complementarity and similarity are therefore not synonymous. A production process involves various economic activities: some may require the same capabilities; others may require different capabilities. In general, complementary activities and similar activities are mutually exclusive, so it is necessary to understand how a firm obtains the capabilities it needs to ensure the successful outcome of a production process.

Richardson refers to three types of coordination: *direction*, *market transactions* and *cooperation*. The first type, *direction*, is the ability of a firm to coordinate the activities itself; this corresponds to the notion of hierarchy in TCE. Because the activities inherent to a production process are not similar, direction cannot be the only means of coordination, hence the need for market transactions and cooperation. The second type of coordination, *market transactions*, is when the firm acquires the capabilities it needs, and is characterised by the fact that coordination is spontaneous. Richardson lists specific situations where recourse to the market is eminently reasonable i.e. when the coordination of investment and output plans between firms *ex ante* is unnecessary. The third type of coordination, *cooperation*, occurs when a firm seeks to establish links with another firm that holds the required capabilities; this supposes reciprocity between the two parties. Cooperation is justified when the coordinated agreement on investment and output plans between both parties *ex ante* is necessary. Richardson's view is that cooperation occurs on a frequent and long lasting basis, whereas in TCE it is considered as a marginal and unstable hybrid form of coordination.

Richardson's definition of economic activities is very wide and seems to have no limit: "*It is convenient to think of industry as carrying out an indefinitely large number of activities, activities related to the discovery and estimation of future wants, to research, development and design, to the execution and co-ordination of processes of physical transformation, the marketing of goods and so on*" (1972, 888). The advantage of this definition is that it is entirely possible to add other forms of activity, such as the production activities undertaken by social enterprises. Richardson's theory can also be used to investigate the reasons why commercial enterprises decide to collaborate with social enterprises and vice versa. Our hypothesis is that each type of enterprise is intent on collaborating in order to gain access to required capabilities for a production process whose objectives are both economic and social. This production process therefore consists of complementary activities which neither enterprise is capable of mastering. SIAEs, in line with the definition of a social enterprise, are tasked with economic production in relation to their particular sphere of activity, and social production in relation to the work integration of people with specific problems at a professional and/or social level. In keeping with our theoretical framework, we view work integration as an activity in its own right, the fulfilment of which requires the enterprise to demonstrate the relevant social capability.

From a methodological perspective, our work is based on a case study undertaken in an SIAE from the Paris area. The SIAE is a not for profit association which we will refer to as Z. It can be identified by the different sectors within which it operates: building, logistics, eco friendly car washing, clearance services, industrial subcontracting, waste sorting, eco friendly deliveries for the retail sector, etc. Over time this SIAE has developed a significant number of links with a range of commercial enterprises. We studied relevant internal documents (operational reports, newsletters, etc.) from the

SIAE and conducted 18 semi-structured interviews with those SIAE/commercial enterprise managers and supervisory staff who were directly involved in the collaborations. Similarly to Austin (2000), we use the term 'collaboration' in a very wide sense. Austin introduced the concept of the "collaboration continuum" which encompasses the various types of relations that occur as collaboration develops. He refers to the stages of development as the philanthropic, the transactional and the integrative stages.

### 3. COLLABORATING AT THE PHILANTHROPIC/TRANSACTIONAL STAGES

The first collaboration that Z established with private businesses took place at the philanthropic stage. This collaboration was with corporate foundations. A number of foundations had listed support for work integration as one of their charitable purposes and Z had successfully achieved a solid relationship with firm A's foundation. We examined the reasons why Z chose to collaborate with firm A's foundation and vice versa.

Z's decision to collaborate with foundations was largely down to finance, but foundations are able to provide much more than finance alone. The collaboration enabled Z to amass 'social capital', hence opening up other commercial opportunities, as well as employment opportunities for its workers at the end of the work placement period. "How do you view the links you have with corporate foundations and endowment funds? Are they purely financially motivated?" "You think we're after their dough! Well, that's the first thing we want from them (laughs). No, seriously. Of course we're happy to accept the money the foundations give. If they want us to do business with them, they have to show their generosity, or else what's the point? Joking apart, there's more than just funding the programmes and donating extra money to support our social objectives, for example, buying a lorry. With foundations it has always been like that, and increasingly it's a way for us to gain access to the main firm. It has helped us develop a whole range of contacts with the main firm".

This response seems to confirm Austin's notion of a "collaboration continuum". Z's aim is to achieve an "across-the-board partnership" that straddles the stages of collaboration. But as Austin points out, the move from one stage to the next is not automatic. Everything depends on the parent firm's spheres of activity and what opportunities there are to strengthen the collaboration. "And so then you can start to think about a shared vision. And once we have that on the table, the next step is to have an across-the-board partnership with the parent firm, with everything that that involves. And that's where it all leads, but it takes time because you have to make the move from being patronised to being recognised. The parent firms have to really care about social stuff and integration. So at the moment, it is as it is; it's moving forward, but it's still not exactly a shared vision".

The stated aim of firm A's foundation is to labour for the common good. The action taken by the foundation is considered by the parent firm as an obligation towards its 'stakeholders' (Abzug & Webb, 1999). "In today's world I believe that all firms have a duty to serve their communities and to be fully involved in what is happening in these communities. In any case, we engage with our stakeholders". To this end, the funding provided to Z is justified by the quality of Z's social capability in supporting its workers. "When I study the details of a back-to-work organisation, my priority is the quality of the support they provide to the people on work placements. There are a fair number of organisations that aren't very professional when it comes to this aspect. All they do is find work for the person and leave it at that. Of course the aim of a back-to-work organisation is to find work for the person, but it's also to set that person on the right path, boost their dignity and help them feel able to do the job. So it's not just the work; there are other issues that have to be dealt with – health, accommodation, mobility, the person's wellbeing, etc. and I'm not talking about the form filling side. I mean, there's a whole social side that we can't manage. It's not our area of expertise. It's what the back-to-work organisations are good at. They help people integrate socially before they integrate professionally. It's also a measure of their effectiveness; we always check how people are looked after, who does the looking after and what the rate of success is".

Another type of collaboration, which ties in with the transactional stage, involves those partnerships whereby Z subcontracts for commercial enterprises.

Our first example is an onsite subcontracting arrangement that Z has at the research facilities of a large cosmetics firm, B. This collaboration came about because of a human resources issue. B's research activity requires the services of staff to clean the utensils used in the laboratory. The need for permanent cleaning staff for this task was out of synch with the management policy that all personnel should have the opportunity to progress in the firm. The decision was therefore taken that on completion of appropriate training, cleaning staff would be internally promoted to the position of technician. "We didn't set out to take people as part of a back-to-work scheme. We had 20 or so staff who were on a very low pay scale and we wanted them to have the opportunity to move up the scale. We wanted them to be able to retrain and get a recognised certificate. That was what we had in mind".

The problem the firm experienced was finding a way to replace staff who were retraining. One possible solution would have been to employ more people, but that would have meant a return to the original human resources issue. In consequence, the firm decided to outsource. The choice of an SIAE as provider was in line with the firm's responsible procurement policy. It seemed a suitable solution because it would ensure that 1) productivity targets were met and 2) staff would only remain in these posts on a temporary basis. "With work integration you have the flexibility to be able to say: 'I'll support someone during a time in their lives when they are re-establishing their identity as a worker and as a person living in accommodation.'" Two years later these workers are skilled at something new and then they can really move on with their lives. This two year period is just the right amount of time for me – the cleaning work in the laboratory continues to be done properly and the workers can feel positive about their future". By outsourcing to Z, B benefits from Z's social capability. "We aren't able to look after this sort of person ourselves. It wouldn't be possible. We're not set up to do it. Even if I went on all the right courses, I would still be out of my depth".

Our second example is similar to the first: an onsite subcontracting arrangement with the logistics department of a large firm, C, whose core activity is the distribution of cultural products. The role of Z is on the handling side – their workers are tasked with looking after the plastic containers that hold the goods ready for dispatch; these containers can then re-enter the automated production line. The decision to outsource this activity was taken by a former CEO who had been keen to promote work integration. C's justification for using Z was largely down to the SIAE's social capability. "You really feel that they support their workers. It's not something I would be able to do, and when I say "I", I mean everyone in the firm; none of us can do it. We can't do it. They'll get help to find somewhere to live, fill out all the forms, etc. We don't have anyone who can do that. We only have one 'social worker' to cover the whole firm, and our department is entitled to a day a week. No, I wouldn't be able to do what Z does. I couldn't. I suppose I could organise something if I had the budget, but in our area that type of money isn't available. No. In all honesty, no".

A third type of collaboration, which could also be considered as transactional, is in relation to joint bidding for public sector contracts where work integration represents one of the bid criteria. The relevant bid in our study was in connection with the running of a recently built waste sorting facility. The responsibility of the successful applicant would be to ensure that the facility was fully operational. In order to comply with the bid's work integration requirements, D entered into a partnership arrangement with Z before applying for this public sector contract. An agreement was made that D would cover half its staffing needs by giving permanent jobs to the workers from Z at the end of their work placement. Z was undertaking subcontracting work for other firms in the sector, so the recruited workers had already been trained as recycling operatives for sorting cabins. "Nowadays local councils insist more often than not that private firms offer work integration opportunities. And what we've done is prepare in advance so that when we make a bid for tender, it's a joint bid and in this particular case, that's exactly what happened. So at the outset Z already had their name on the bid".

Z's contribution to D's bid was to help D meet the criteria for the bid: Z would train, assign and accompany the workers on placement. "It's about placing the people who have used up their two years at the SIAE. I mean, Z's goal is to pre-recruit these people, train them for placements in the waste management sector, and then put them forward as candidates under the terms of the partnership deal between Z and us. So there are trial periods, training and the like. We do what are known in the trade as 'monthly progress reports' – three way reports involving the project manager from Z, the worker from Z and us. This is to check if everything is OK, what needs to improve, and if the worker is fine with the placement and happy to continue. And as soon as the person is ready, their name is put forward for a permanent job".

Recruitment is a gradual process. Z provides a non profit labour force for a period of time. This effectively becomes a trial period during which Z endeavours to safeguard the recruitment. "The work at D isn't easy. There's quite a lot of pressure goes with the job. But on the other hand, 14 of Z's workers are now permanently employed at D. And we've worked alongside the operations manager, which has meant that the 14 workers ended up with a job. If we hadn't communicated with each other, well, some of those 14 would barely have lasted three days. It might have taken 5 or 6 months for them to be integrated into the workplace, but they've done it. They all have a permanent job. They have a proper job. And some have even taken a step further".

Here the social capability is Z's provision of a specific resource to D: a reliable workforce consisting of people on placement. The advantage of the collaboration for Z is the move towards sustainable employment for the workers who are placed at D. This represents the achievement of the SIAE's objectives.

#### 4. COLLABORATING AT THE INTEGRATIVE STAGE

The following two cases fit perfectly with Austin's integrative stage. Z recently began collaborating with commercial enterprises to create two joint ventures (jointly held subsidiaries). Although the circumstances for creating these joint ventures were entirely different, from both Z's and the commercial enterprises' point of view, the reasoning behind each collaboration was similar.

The first joint venture, X, specialises in home delivery for urban areas and is positioned in the large retail sector. Z's partner, E, a commercial enterprise, is a leader in the sector. X was created to respond to a very specific market. The firm provides an eco-delivery service. This service came about because of the observation that the majority of deliveries involved a small amount of goods. The idea was therefore to use a goods bicycle instead of a standard vehicle, thereby reducing the environmental impact of the deliveries. X had been originally set up in Paris by its founder as a limited company with no links whatsoever to the work integration sector. The sustainable development focus had only been viewed in terms of a positive impact on the environment, not as an opportunity for work integration. It was the director of Z who had seen the potential for placing a specific group of people i.e. relatively employable young people, in this activity. Z had therefore acquired X because of this potential, but X did not have a solid financial base to build on. After it had joined the social enterprise group, X, whose founder was still in charge, began to expand into other regions on the back of Z's financial resources and additional work integration funding. However, very soon after the acquisition of X, liquidity problems came to light and the firm was placed in administrative receivership. Z chose to enter into partnership with a commercial enterprise specialised in home delivery as a way to ensure that X would not be declared bankrupt.

In the short term, the priority for Z was to save X from bankruptcy by going into partnership with E. The collaboration did however prove to offer a number of advantages for each party over the long term. X's administrative receivership proceedings had occurred because of badly planned growth and poor market positioning. "X is a typical example of what happens if you underestimate the transport side of delivering goods in a city centre. There's the technical aspect and then there are all the specifics you need to know about. Without going into detail, problems arose because of a lack of

technical knowledge, but also because of a lack of understanding of high volume flows, the last-mile delivery market, information systems, etc. There was just too big a jump to make. And so we were in a sector without the wherewithal to make a go of it. We had underestimated the specifics and we had underestimated how big a jump we had to make. And what's more, we didn't go into partnership with another firm because we expected X to have the necessary expertise; it was a takeover of a firm from the transport sector. And so what we realised was that we didn't have the technical knowhow (we knew this already), but that X didn't have much either. They certainly didn't have enough. And of course this ignorance of the transport sector created the problems and led to us going into partnership with E, a firm who are leaders in the last-mile sector and who know the trade like the back of their hand".

The consequences of collaborating with E were that X's business strategy was altered; X's services were directed towards various profitable niche markets. The parcel service was dropped in favour of home delivery services for supermarket chains, a sector in which E was already established. E therefore picked up the transport side of the service, leaving Z to concentrate on the work integration side. "Z's role isn't to run the business; their role is to implement the integration – they have to organise the whole thing, look after the workers, set up the procedure and ensure that this procedure is successful for the workers who do the work placements".

E had strong economic reasons to invest in X (it holds 51% of the equity), especially as X had to be partially bailed out after being placed in administrative receivership. The partnership can be justified on two levels. Firstly, there was the firm's 'licence to operate', an expression used in resource dependency theory. E's stakeholders were putting pressure on E to change its operational methods in line with the need to protect the environment. Local authorities and E's business clients were also exhorting E to become more environmentally conscious as they too were feeling the heat of public opinion. "We were interested in X because of the local councils and the local area. It was a way to keep working in the local area. Let's say in an easier way, like we do today. But we also had to think about our business clients. Our clients are major distributors. And some of them are fully committed to a policy of corporate, social and environmental responsibility, so we were regularly being asked: "When are you going to start using bike riders to make the deliveries? There are plenty of firms that use delivery tricycles" and so on".

The second justification for the partnership was highlighted by Z, not E. The issue was one of turnover. As an SIAE, Z had expertise in supporting people with little or no qualifications. By focusing on E's need for a lower turnover, Z was able to convince E to enter into a partnership without the integration component being pushed into the background. "It's a difficult job, and it's not the type of work that suits everyone, so the turnover is fairly high. But Z is also one of the biggest employers of unskilled young people in the Ile-de-France region, and these are young people from the estates, you know. Quite a few move into management posts. So there was already a culture of employing young people and we wanted to tap into this culture. And they were saying to themselves: "Recruiting vulnerable young people with challenging behaviour – well, we don't really know how to handle them. It's difficult to know how to handle them in a business which has rules and regulations."" Once again, Z's contribution to the collaboration was its social capability i.e. the ability to set up a system of integration for a specific group of workers that would reduce the level of turnover.

The second joint venture, Y, a logistics firm, had been developed in partnership with F, a commercial enterprise and also a leader in its sector. The project was not something new for Z. As an SIAE, Z was primarily interested in finding suitable employment opportunities for people with disabilities who were already registered with them. It was also interested in encouraging the workers with disabilities to consider a 'Work Choice' approach to employment rather than a 'sheltered environment' approach, which despite providing permanent jobs, offered little incentive to look for mainstream employment. "There were several things we noticed at the beginning. We had a number of people with disabilities on our books and we were struggling to help these people find work placements. In France the world of disability is disconnected from the notion of work placements in firms, which is what work integration is all about".

Y's sector of activity was chosen with care. Z had seen the possibilities of logistics services for work integration and had already invested time and effort in it. A considerable number of unqualified workers were needed in logistics services and it was a sector characterised by employment prospects. However, it was a sector which had also been experiencing profound changes and this had had a destabilising effect on Z. Clients were no longer looking for small firms like Z which offered limited infrastructure and expertise. Z was therefore keen to develop a joint venture with a large logistics firm. "With this in mind, there were lots of good reasons for us to be involved in e-commerce with Y: co-packing fits in well with work integration for people with disabilities and it's an area we wanted to develop an expertise in. But there were too many obstacles, and on our own we would have taken an age to offer something, and even then it would never have been anywhere near as good as what the big firms can offer. That's why we knew from the outset of the project that we had to partner up with a big logistics firm, a firm like F".

The joint venture only came about after the intervention of a third firm, G. G was a client of both F and Z, and it was G who established the bridge between the two organisations; G then became Y's first client. G's motivation was based on its desire to respond to the public mood regarding people with disabilities in work. "So why were we interested in work integration? And basically, why was I interested in it? Well, we weren't doing enough with the sheltered employment sector, and I wanted to lower our contributions by 2, 3, even 4%". Starting Y was also in response to the potential demand from business clients who had to comply with French employment legislation for people with disabilities.

As far as F was concerned, the stated reasons for becoming involved in Y (it holds 49% of the equity) were to do with showing committedness. "Were there any other reasons apart from committedness? Because on the face of it..." "Well, we're not doing it for the money. Or the publicity, because we haven't done very much in the way of publicity. No, it was the idea of the social project that appealed to us". We can nevertheless hypothesise that although F was keen to improve its reputation (Huybrechts & Nicholls, 2011), it was also keen to gain a presence in an area of activity that clients would be able to benefit from in terms of 'employment of people with disabilities' statutory contributions i.e. an increase in 'unités bénéficiaires' (a 'unité bénéficiaire' [earnings unit] is equivalent to one worker with disabilities in full-time employment). "Y's activities don't interest F. The sums are too small. They want activities that generate millions of euros. Y's value to them is being able to say that they offer an extra e-commerce service. But first and foremost it's the internal publicity that interests them because the impact of the partnership on their billings is negligible. As they keep telling us: "We admire what you do, but that's as far as it goes"".

F clearly indicates that managing people on work placements is entirely different from their usual way of doing things. "First and foremost we manage our personnel in such a way that they perform to their maximum, whereas Z and Y focus on social inclusion through work. So the type of organisations we approach to provide the order pickers and forklift truck operators for our warehouses are completely different from the centres Z and Y use to recruit skilled workers. For us, social responsibility means fulfilling our contracts and performing to the best of our abilities; these are our core aims. In other words, we will do our utmost to find processes and solutions that facilitate the workforce in such a way that we outperform our competitors. What does staff support mean to us? It's the standard support: working conditions, the right clothing and how the work space is organised. And as always we have that very specific goal in mind of performing at our best to meet the terms of the contract that has persuaded the client to trust us with their goods and their logistic support in the first place. With Z, the approach to support is fundamentally different. It's with people who at any given moment, and maybe all the time, are at their lowest ebb because of a range of personal problems. The aim is to help these people rediscover their dignity and their place in life through employment". When this type of circumstance is in play, the collaboration with Z is important in the sense that F does not consider to have Z's social capability. "Could you ever imagine this type of support being on offer to all your staff?" "But it's not something we do. We wouldn't know how to do it. We don't have the expertise. It's not something we do".

## 5. CONCLUSION

For the SIAE, collaborating with a commercial enterprise provides an opportunity to become involved in certain production processes; these processes then provide an opportunity for work integration. They also allow the SIAE access to the commercial enterprise's capabilities, which are mainly related to the commercial enterprise's particular expertise. For the commercial enterprise, collaborating with an SIAE may provide an opportunity to fulfil their corporate, social and environmental responsibilities (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009). The social enterprise's work integration comes across as being an activity in its own right, complementary to the commercial enterprise's production processes. The theory advocated by Richardson therefore represents a relevant framework to highlight the complementarity underpinning collaboration between commercial and social enterprises.

The manner in which complementarity has come across in our study may have given the impression that collaborations between SIAEs and commercial enterprises should be actively encouraged. However, in reality this social/private coming together is progressing at a very slow pace and there exist few examples of robust collaborations. Our evidence may not therefore reflect the norm, but it does identify the types of circumstance which favour collaborations. One condition is that commercial enterprises embrace the integration of people with specific problems at a professional and/or social level within their policy of corporate, social and environmental responsibility; this rarely happens without a strong business motive underpinning the proposed venture. Another condition is that SIAEs engage in complementarity with commercial enterprises, but this brings with it the presumption that the SIAE is able to ignore the possibility of its social *raison d'être* being overshadowed in some way. And albeit that the inclusion of 'social clauses' in public sector contracts may promote collaborations, the success of any collaboration will also depend on the ability of all those involved to work towards a mutually beneficial compromise (Di Domenico et al., 2009).

## REFERENCES

- ABZUG, R. & WEBB, N.J. (1999), "Relationships between nonprofit and for-profit organizations: a stakeholder perspective", *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, vol. 28, 416-431.
- AUSTIN, J.E. (2000), "Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and business", *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, n°29, 69-97.
- DI DOMENICO M.L., TRACEY P. & HAUGH H. (2009), "The Dialectic of social exchange: theorizing corporate-social enterprise collaboration", *Organization studies*, n°30, 887-907.
- GALASKIEWICZ, J. & COLMAN, M.S. (2006), "Collaborations between Corporations and Nonprofit Organizations", in POWELL, W.W. & STEINBERG, R. (eds.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 180-204.
- GOOGINS, B. & ROCHLIN, S. (2000), "Creating the Partnership Society: Understanding the Rhetoric and Reality of Cross Sector Partnerships", *Business and Society Review*, vol. 105, n°1, 127-144.
- HARRIS, M. (2012), "Nonprofits and business: toward a subfield of nonprofit studies", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 41, n°5, 892-902.
- HUYBRECHTS, B. & NICHOLLS, A. (2011), "Social enterprise-corporate collaboration and organizational legitimacy: insights from fair trade", *3<sup>rd</sup> EMES International Research Conference on social enterprise*, July 4-7, Roskilde.
- HUXHAM, C. (Ed.) (1996), *Creating collaborative advantage*, London: Sage.
- LONDON, T., RONDINELLI, D. A. & O'NEILL H. (2005), "Strange Bedfellows: Alliances Between Corporations and Non-Profits", in SHENKAR, O. & REUER, J. (eds.), *Handbook of Strategic Alliances*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 353-366.
- O'REGAN, K.M. & OSTER, S.M. (2000), "Nonprofit and For-Profit Partnerships: Rationale and Challenges of Cross-Sector Contracting", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 29, n°1, 120-140.
- PENROSE, E. (1995; orig. 1959), *The theory of the growth of the firm*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RICHARDSON, G.B. (1972), « The Organization of industry », *Economic Journal*, n°82, 883-896.
- SEITANIDI, M.M & CRANE, A. (2009), "Implementing CSR through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design and Institutionalisation of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 85, n°2, 251-477.
- SELSKY, J. W. & PARKER, B. (2005), "Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice", *Journal of Management*, vol. 31, n°6, 1-25.
- STOKOLS, D. & TRIVEDI, C. (2011), « Social enterprises and corporate enterprises: fundamental differences and defining features », *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, vol. 20, n°1, 1-32.
- WILLIAMSON, O. E. (1985), *The Economic institutions of capitalism: firms, markets, relational contracting*, New York: The Free Press.