Whose Public Action?
Analysing Inter-sectoral Collaboration for Service Delivery
NGPA Workshop, 28 February 2008

Discussion Paper 9: Links between themes emerging from the nine WPA case studies and key issues in the literature

Kelly Teamey

International Development Department
University of Birmingham

Drawing on papers by Nurul Alam, Masooda Bano, Padmaja Nair, Richard Batley and Kelly Teamey[1]

---

[1] The substance of the evidence in this paper draws on the three country reports and the literature review. These have been re-analysed for the purposes of this paper, and so any mistakes are the responsibility of the author. Further analysis of interview transcripts and other documentation is still needed. The structure of the paper draws on the framework applied in the literature review by Teamey (2007)

1. Summary and overview

The aim of this paper is to make explicit the links between the key issues discussed and examined in the literature review and themes emerging from all nine of the WPA case studies. This paper highlights the contributions of the WPA research to the wider literature on NSP-government relationships (see Teamey 2007), indicates places in which the WPA research adds more significantly to the literature and discusses relevant themes and findings emerging from each of the case studies with reference to each of the key issues examined in the literature review.

At a general level, themes emerging from the WPA case studies appear to contribute to the majority of aspects discussed in the literature review in terms of issues related to research methods applied, institutional conditioning factors, the nature and agenda of the organisation and the nature of the relationship. The WPA research has engaged with the complexities of the NSP-government relationships examined in each case study by linking together the *macro* policy, legislative and political frameworks in each country context, *meso* programme-level objectives and approaches and *micro* historical, contextual and organisational factors conditioning each relationship. The research questions and methodological approaches applied in the WPA research emphasised history (within macro, meso and micro domains), context and recognised the complexity of factors that condition relationships.

The WPA research extended beyond the comparative advantage approach as it examined and made explicit the strategies used by each organisation and the dynamics of the relationship as it evolves. In the WPA case studies, historical influences were related to many factors (amongst others): strategies and tactics of advocacy and service delivery; the legal framework in place to support NGOs (evolving from particular political and economic contexts); policy objectives; globalisation influences more generally; donor influences through their objectives, implementation techniques, targets and measurement; state regime types; ideologies driving the organisation's vision and activities; individual leadership and associated networks; varied levels of government; expansion of the organisation; and sector-wide trends

In addition to the contributions articulated in the paper by Richard Batley on 'conditioning factors' there are several additional areas where the WPA case studies contribute significantly to the literature on NSP-government relationships:

* Sectoral *and* country comparisons within a region with a shared cultural history (see pages 3 and 4 for a brief discussion on research contributions)
* A variety of applicable theoretical frameworks that can help to further draw out key themes emerging from each case study (see pages 4 and 5)
* The examination of different levels of government engages with complexity of not just the NSP but the government side as well (see pages 10 and 11 for a discussion on the different levels of government)
* Emphasising a focus on the organisations' visions of public action and level of involvement with local communities – these areas are under-represented in the literature (see pages 11 and 12 for a discussion on original values and vision)
* The twin roles and nuances (including strategies and tactics) of advocacy and service delivery that the majority of NSPs are simultaneously engaged in (see pages 16 - 18 for a discussion on the roles of participants)
* The nuances of autonomy within the evolution of the relationship under examination in each case study (see pages 21 22)
* Isomorphism does not occur due to the complexity and diversity of each NSP that is path dependent (see discussion on page 22)

2. Previous Research

There are several areas in the literature on NSP-government relationships that lack empirical evidence. To begin with, there are few studies that have really engaged with and tried to make sense of the complexities of relationships. Related to this, the literature does not sufficiently engage with the factors that condition relationships within and between different levels (i.e. macro, meso and micro). Nor does it adequately take on the influences of the policy environment, for example, through policies, standards, targets and methods of measurement that distinguish levels of effectiveness and success. The WPA research contributes to research needs identified in the literature on NSP-government relationships as it has engaged with the complexities of the NSP-government relationships examined in each case study by linking together the *macro* policy, legislative and political frameworks in each country context, *meso* programme-level objectives and approaches and *micro* historical, contextual and organisational factors conditioning each relationship.

Of all the empirical studies identified in the literature review, there are only a few that fully take into account the context, complexities and evolution of relationships between NSP-government relationships. Ramanath's (2005) is by far the most pertinent empirical study as it describes in detail the evolution of three different NGOs and the ways in which they strategically positioned themselves to both challenge and co-operate with government. Hilhorst's (2003) ethnography of NGOs in the Cordillera region of the Philippines is also relevant although its main unit of analysis is the NGO, not any particular relationship per se. However, that said, it analyses multiple relationships associated with different NGOs and with government agencies. Lewis's (1998) multi-organisational study provides insight into the dynamics of different stakeholders involved in a development partnership project in Bangladesh, taking into account the context and ideological interests associated with the project, including those of the government and NGOs. Pettigrew's (2003) action research study of a multi-organisational partnership is an innovative study that attempts to portray the formal 'front-staging' of the partnership and the informal day-to-day 'back-staging'.

The features of history, context, complexity and power were discussed extensively in the literature as being the most appropriate characteristics to explore within research carried out on relationships between NSPs and government. The literature indicates that there is a lack of research examining 'from the inside' focusing on the detailed everyday realities of organisations and how dynamics link with shifting policy demands. There is a lack of attention to the complexity of organisations and the dynamics of their varied evolving relationships which has made it so that the majority of research on NSP-government relationships creates static categories of the relationship rather than examining how they have shifted over time and within different levels of government and the particular NSP. The research in the literature also tends to be under-theorised and possessing a lack of detail on the formal and informal rules governing the relationship.

The research questions and methodological approaches applied in the WPA research emphasised history (within macro, meso and micro domains), context and recognised the complexity of factors that condition relationships.   Although the WPA research did not explicitly apply a theoretical framework to examine 'power' per se, the evolutionary processes shaping and guiding each relationship was studied in a way in which 'power' was an implicit and integral factor.

There are very few examples of comparisons of alternative modes of engagement and no examples of comparison across different service delivery sectors within the relevant literature. Within each case study, the WPA research examined the evolution of the

relationship as well as the factors that have formed (and conditioned the agendas) of non-state and government agencies in the relationship. The WPA research extended beyond the comparative advantage approach as it examined and made explicit the strategies used by each organisation and the dynamics of the relationship as it evolves.

The WPA research is in alignment with the majority of research studies discussed in the literature review that used a combination of qualitative research methods including interviews, document analysis, historical analysis and participant observation. The method of applying an historical analysis within the WPA research was similar to other studies in that we used archival evidence, organisational and sector programme document analysis and interviews with 'key informants'. Ethnographic approaches were found to be valuable across several empirical studies on NSP-government relationships. However, the WPA research was unable to fully apply an ethnographic perspective due to a lack of time and financial resources. In spite of this, our research methods include participant observations in relevant meetings and events and field notes to better inform interview and document data.

Relevant theories
Few of the studies examined in the literature review rigorously applied a theoretical framework to understand and explain NSP-government relationships. This was in spite of the fact that much of the literature argued for the need to apply more theory to research examining NSP-government relationships. There are several theoretical frameworks suggested in the literature that can be used to make stronger arguments links between some of the themes emerging from the case studies.

Principal-agency and social capital theories were central to the initial research proposal, although principal agency theory was not sufficient to explore NSP-government relationships. Theories of social capital are a valuable contribution to the WPA research, as it was observed that all of the case study relationships are influenced by and influence other actors in networks, alliances and coalitions of individuals within other NGOs, government agencies, donor agencies and civil society organisations. Each of the case studies outlined and mapped out key relationships influencing the relationship under examination. Evans (1996) notion of social capital is useful to capture how relationships are embedded within networks of trust and are complementary through being mutually supportive. Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) notion of social capital is useful in combination with Bourdieu's field theory, using 'cultural capital' to capture an organisation's perceived value of their technical knowledge or expertise as in the cases of OPP, ITA, PRSP, Shelter and Karuna Trust.

Ramanath's (2005) use of ecological theory in her doctoral dissertation to capture the evolving complexity of three NGOs is useful in the WPA research to illustrate how particular NGOs have expended in size and complexity (i.e. DSS, OPP, FIVDB and UST). This links with social origins theory as explained (but not applied) by Wamai (2004) arguing that NGOs are not an isolated phenomenon but part of an integral part of the social system and their role and scale is a by-product of historical forces.

Resource dependency theory is useful to explain the financial dependency occurring in some case study relationships (e.g. all three Bangladesh cases) and knowledge resources dependency as well (e.g. OPP and Shelter).

French and Raven's (1959) theoretical framework of power could be applied to each of the cases to make sense of some of the tensions and differences types of dominance, strategies and tactics undertaken by each of the organisations. In addition, Foucault's power/knowledge theoretical framework can help to explain issues of legitimacy within many of the case studies (e.g. OPP, ITA, Shelter, UST, DSS, Karuna)

Theoretical concepts associated with hegemony could help to explain the over-used but under-applied notion of 'partnership'. For example, the notion of 'empty signifier' could help to explain increasing dominance of the use of the term 'partnership' in policy and contractual documentation and how seldom this concept is actualised in practice.

Other theories that might add insight to better understand different themes emerging from the NSP-government relationships are New Institutional Economics theory, Inter-Organisational Relations (IOR) and theories of power. Theories of political economy, although not identified in empirical studies, provide possible value.

Welle's (2001) empirical study comparing two relationships a particular NNGO is engaged in (i.e. with an INGO and with a local government agency) in Ghana is a useful example of the value of using a discourse approach to understanding the links between language and power, through a critical approach to understanding how the partners understood and defined 'partnership' and what was actually carried out in practice. Furthermore, Welle's study suggests a link between discourses of 'partnership' and discourses of 'public action' or social development which is the central theme in the WPA research. This helps to explain a couple of the Bangladesh cases, particularly PSTC and FIVDB.

Comparative advantages and typologies
The claim that NSPs are able to fill the gaps left by state failure is made partly on the grounds of their greater efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery. Many donor organisations have favoured NGOs (or NSPs more generally) as a means of democratising, remedying poverty, strengthening civil society, and substituting for government agencies. As organisations, NSPs are widely perceived as being structured in a less hierarchical, more democratic and flexible form than government. NSPs are generally understood not to have profit seeking motives and to have a greater commitment to serving and working with the poor. The looser organisational forms and dedicated agendas of NGOs are associated with a view of them as more innovative, accountable, effective in terms of cost and delivery, and having greater local and community knowledge than government agencies and officials. NSPs are also valued as having the capacity to challenge government approaches and practices through advocacy and therefore valued as a 'watchdog' over the government (Sood 2000).

Critiques of perceived comparative advantages include:
- The greater legitimacy or 'success' in service delivery of NGOs are rarely supported by evidence to back the claims of comparative advantage;
- NGOs may also have hierarchical and bureaucratic characteristics and a consequent lack of democratic accountability, particularly as they expand in size and scope;
- The cost-effectiveness of NGOs is questionable;
- NGOs may not reach the poor, particularly the 'poorest' of the poor;
- NGOs may undermine the role of the state;
- NGOs may not challenge oppressive power relations within communities (e.g. local elites);
- Scale of coverage is often limited and patchy;
- There may be competition between NGOs leading to fragmentation and overlap;
- NGOs may have little autonomy from donor agencies and undergo 'depoliticisation'

As discussed in the literature review, Lewis (1998) argues that fixed notions of 'comparative advantages' were not appropriate to describe the incentives for

organisations to involved in a partnership as the partnership was created through informal, personal links and evolving relationships. This was similar in the WPA case studies. In some cases there was a combination of positively and negatively perceived comparative advantages at play within the NSPs relationships with different levels of government. The perceived comparative advantages of each particular NGO and government agency participating in the partnership were different and changed over time.

The WPA research agenda did not seek to simplify NSP-government relationships into a particular typology; indeed the research was not so much interested in classification as in describing the dynamics of relations about 'public action'. The WPA research recognises that relationships are multi-dimensional and that they change and evolve. From this perspective, a typology may be of relevance in as much as it can provide a reference or entry point to understanding relations. For example, Najam's (2000) typology argues that by understanding the concepts (i.e. cooperation, co-optation, complementarity and confrontation) illustrated in the model below, as a matter of strategic choice (i.e. a priority agenda) and explaining them in terms of varying and converging institutional interests, one is more likely to arrive at a relevant and robust understanding of relationships. Najam's model does not take sides in comparing the advantages of one organisation over the other, but rather focuses on the strategic interests driving the NSP and the government to be in the relationship. Although tensions exist between NGOs and government, both sets of actors realise fundamental benefits from the partnership. Najam's relationship types are not mutually exclusive; there might be both co-operative and confrontational relationships at the same time, within the same relationship. This is supported in empirical research carried out by Sood (2000) and Ramanath (2005).

The four C's of NGO-government relations

| | | Goals (Ends) | |
		Similar	Dissimilar
Preferred Strategies	Similar	**Cooperation**	**Co-optation**
(Means)	Dissimilar	**Complementarity**	**Confrontation**

(Najam 2000)

Using Najam's typological model, it could be argued that all of the WPA cases have exhibited a complementarity type of relationship at some point in time - in that the envisaged goals are similar but the means to achieve those ends are different. However, some cases also exhibit confrontation, cooperation and/or co-optation simultaneously or at different moments in the evolution of the relationship, or with different individuals at different levels of government, particularly those that are engaged in various advocacy strategies and tactics.

3. Relevance of the literature to the WPA research and key themes emerging from the WPA case studies

3.1 Institutional conditioning factors

Institutional conditioning factors constitute the context in which NSPs and government agencies operate. These conditioning factors include a range of political, legal, social and cultural institutions. The key issues identified and discussed in the literature as representative of institutional conditioning factors are *historical influences, legislative frameworks, policies and institutions, globalisation forces, donor influences* and *state regime type.*

The WPA case studies provide extensive details about political and legal institutional factors conditioning the relationship. Less details are provided on social and cultural institutional factors as there was not an extensive amount of time spent examining the 'inside' of the organisations. The WPA research case studies demonstrate that the institutional context in part conditions the formation of the organisations: their interests; values, ideologies, understandings and goals; assets and capacity; decision-making processes and organisational structures affecting the agenda and commitments that organisations bring to the encounter with 'partners'; and their incentives for entering into relationships.

History
Several studies in the literature review provided rich details of political, social, economic and/or cultural historical aspects influencing NSP-government relationships as either the primary focus of the study or as background to the evolution of the relationship under study. Sen's (1999) study for example carefully tracks the history of NGO-government relationships in India has been a valuable input to better understand historical influences emerging from the WPA research. Historical influences are a central component to all stages of the WPA research and have been examined in the macro (country), meso (sector programme) and micro (organisational and relationship) contexts.

'History' as a core concept to understanding NSP-government relationships is ambiguous in terms of what, when, how and according to whom 'history' is prioritised. In the WPA case studies, historical influences were related to many factors (amongst others): strategies and tactics of advocacy and service delivery; the legal framework in place to support NGOs (evolving from particular political and economic contexts); policy objectives; globalisation influences more generally; donor influences through their objectives, implementation techniques, targets and measurement; state regime types and critical incidents; ideologies driving the organisation's vision and activities; individual leadership and associated networks; varied levels of government; expansion of the organisation; sector-wide trends; and general funding opportunities.

Legislation and legal requirements
As depicted in the WPA case studies and the literature on NSP-government relationships, legislation defines the environments in which NGOs operate, restricting or enabling NGO activities. Mayhew's (2005) detailed empirical study on the legislative histories of NGO-government relationships in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal and Vietnam is particularly relevant to the WPA research, especially with its geographical focus in South Asia. The WPA research prioritised the identification and analysis of legal requirements for the registration and activities of NSPs in each country.

All nine of the NSPs within the WPA research case studies have a similar legislative registration with the Societies Registration Act that was created during the British

colonial regime and is currently still in force. Each of the cases are also registered under additional country and sector specific legislative frameworks that condition the NSPs 'room for manoeuvre'.

Policy and standards
The degree of influence of policy objectives and standards as conditioning factors of NSP-government relationships varies with particular sectoral programmes, context and the approaches taken by various stakeholders. Some policies explicitly state the importance of partnerships between NSPs and government in successfully delivering basic services. Successful service delivery is often equated to achieving policy targets, which is sometimes seen as being more possible through a collaborative approach. Through an implicit comparative advantage approach, partnerships are often portrayed as a valuable way of achieving policy ends.

The WPA research identified key sector-specific policy areas or programmes, in which there are expectations of partnership at an international as well as national level. All three of the education-focused case studies are explicitly influenced by the Education for All international objectives and corresponding national EFA plans of action. To ITA, the Pakistan education case, policy openings were critical to the birth of the organisation. FIVDB in Bangladesh is influenced by the MDGs, EFA and the Non-Formal Education policy framework in Bangladesh. DSS is influenced by the Indian SSA (i.e. EFA) framework and policies related to the rights of slum dwellers. Each of the health cases are influenced by the international policy movement on Health for All through Public-Private Partnerships and Primary or Basic Health Care Units. In the sanitation cases, policy was more influential in the Bangladesh UST case because of the Government of Bangladesh's high prioritisation of 100% sanitation through the National Strategy of Sanitation. Shelter, the Indian sanitation case, is responding to events following the International Water and Sanitation Decade and slum-dwelling policies. OPP, the Pakistan sanitation case responds to community needs much more closely rather than to any specific policy.

Globalisation
In the literature review, globalisation was identified as a separate but linked issue with other conditioning factors; several authors highlight the significance of globalisation in influencing NSP-government relationships. Global forces may be influential through policies and donor preferences. Bouget and Prouteau (2002) provide a constructive discussion of the implications of internationalisation/globalisation for national government-NGO relations, as noted in the review. In the WPA research, issues pertaining to globalisation are very clearly linked, particularly through the priority of Public-Private Partnerships and devolution/decentralisation policy frameworks. However, there is a need to theorise globalisation before making explicit the role of globalisation effects with the case studies.

Donors
The greater part of the relevant literature has argued that donor agencies have a direct impact on the dynamics of NSP-government interactions through their control of funding, knowledge, opportunities and constraints. The influence of donor agencies is at all levels – incentives, design, objectives, implementation techniques and target/measurement expectations. Some literature on the influence of donor agencies on NSP-government relationships is particularly worthwhile. For example, the study undertaken by Lister (2000) on a relationship between a national NGO, international NGO and a bi-lateral donor agency provides insight into the different forms of power each organisation has on the other and on the divergent perspectives and value each places on the other. Tvedt (2006) made the case for the inseparable link between donors, the state and NGOs, coining the term 'DoStaNGO' system.

The WPA research framework included the examination of donor influences within each case study. The cases have gone into considerable depth as to the overall influence of donors on particular NSPs, particularly in terms of resource dependency. Those case studies in which the relationships are based in part by government funding through large bidding processes have involved greater levels of tension (e.g. FIVDB and PSTC) than those that are not based on bidded contracts. With reference to particular donors, each case study expands on detailed influence of some donors more than others. There is the case for further examining the influence of particular donors on some of the relationships under study in the WPA research.

The NSPs in the case studies have varied orientations to how they approach donors, which seems to be linked with their ideological vision. In Pakistan, ITA responds to whatever donors (government, multi-lateral, bi-lateral, private, individual and INGO) they are able to obtain funding from to further their education work. OPP on the other hand, objects to any point source donor funding; their ideological vision and agenda arose as completely separate from any donor agenda. PRSP was funded by a government contract. Although there was no donor having a direct role in the relationship between PRSP and the government, the World Bank has publicised the success of the project.

In India, Karuna Trust now receives the majority of its funding from the Indian government, the other funding comes from individuals, private institutions and institutional grants from multi-lateral donors. Shelter has limited donor influence (although funded by USAID-FIRE initially). However, Shelter is consistently attempting to locate funding as sanitation in India is a lower priority. DSS is most influenced by funding from the government as it is working within and alongside government schools. Interestingly, all three case studies in India are linked with the Ashoka Organisation, a social entrepreneurial funding agency; the directors of Shelter and DSS are both Ashoka Fellows and Karuna Trust is trying to obtain funding from Ashoka.

In Bangladesh, FIVDB is consistently searching for funding. FIVDB has two main sources of funding, INGOs (i.e. Christian Aid) and bi-lateral donors (i.e. DFID). PSTC and UST are both funded by WaterAid. The funding for PSTC is from a combination of their finances, multi-lateral agencies (i.e. ADB) and INGOs (WaterAid and ActionAid). UST does not have any core donor which makes them financially unstable. In their sanitation programmes, UST obtains the majority of its funding from WaterAid which has a strong influence on UST's overall vision. The relationship between UST and WaterAid is shaped by WaterAid's global agenda.

Political regime
The dynamics of NSP-government relationships vary with different political regimes. The nature of the state and socio-political contexts under which NSPs emerge are essential for understanding NSP-government relationships. NSP-government relationships are the product of the space created by the government over time. In the literature review, Pereira (2005) provides insight into the role of the state in determining NSP-government relationships through an empirical study comparing health sector reform efforts through NSP-government relationships in Chile and Uruguay. Sen (1999) also provides particular insight into the influence of different political regimes at the national and state levels in India.

The WPA research investigated the patterns of NSP-government relationships in association with different governmental regimes in each country, over time. One of the emerging themes from the WPA case studies are the various but simultaneous roles of NGOs with different government agencies - as contractor, partner, agent and one of

opposition, depending upon a range of factors that are historically conditioned. In addition to the case studies, the history synthesis, country reports and Batley's conditioning factors paper each draw upon the particular historical political path in each country context. The depth of these varied papers is some of the major contributions of the WPA research to the literature on NSP-government relationships.

3.2 Nature of organisations

The nature of the NSP and different levels of government involved in the particular relationship under study within each of the cases is a core area of the WPA research. The key issues identified and discussed in the literature as representative of the nature of the organisation include: *different levels of government, NSPs and their origins and values (including their vision of 'public action'); the internal management of NSPs; boundaries; civil society and the state; networks, alliances, coalitions, linkages of NSPs and government agencies; key individuals/leaders.* It is difficult to provide great depth to these issues within the WPA case studies as time spent examining the 'inside' of each organisation was limited. However, the range of interviews and observations across different levels of each NSP, different government agencies and individuals and organisations from associated networks and alliances has provided the WPA research with a wealth of information on the dynamics of each NSP-government case study that contributes to the overall literature in terms of the nature of the organisation and its influence on their relationships.

Different levels of government
Much of the literature argued against essentialising the government as a unitary entity or phenomenon, particularly with reference to the importance of differentiating between central and local government. Dynamics of NSP-government relationships are different at different levels of government where the relationship has different dynamics and types of interaction. Thompson's (2005) study using governmentality theory to examine relationships between different levels of government in the UK is a useful study demonstrating how the internal organisation of government relies on a network that is defined both by their geographical territories and functional remit. Sen (1999) argued for the importance of examining government at the local level, including politicians, party workers, local elites and lower level bureaucrats.

The unit of analysis within the WPA research included different levels of government. The examination of these different levels of government is a significant contribution of the WPA research to the literature on NSP-government relationships. Interviews were carried out with members of the local, district, regional and national governments. The frequency and intensity of the relationship across different levels of government varied within each case. In addition, individuals within different levels of government held particular significance, especially those where there is a higher turnover (e.g. Shelter case).

In Pakistan, the main areas of focus in the ITA and PRSP cases are at the district level, although both also engage with the central government. ITA does not aim to cultivate relationships at any level in particular, rather the relationship is in flux dependent upon the specific project. PRSP has not been able to maintain its relationship with the government (it is ending very abruptly). For OPP the main area of focus is with the central government, although OPP has developed a stable, consultative and extensive relationship with all levels of government because it is seen as legitimate. However, in Pakistan determining the main area of focus is more complicated because although there are stated devolution policy frameworks, the military has been very slow to devolve power and it therefore remains concentrated at the centre.

In India, the NSPs in all three cases are hesitant to work with government because of cumbersome procedures and perceived corruption. However, all three NSPs cannot avoid working with the government on some level. The relationships are different at the operational and decision-making levels in the health and education cases as the state agencies in each of the sectors are very large with several layers of authority and levels of functionaries. In the Karuna Trust case, the intensity of interactions is greater at the Taluka and district levels although policy decisions are made at the state level. The state level is happy with the performance of Karuna whereas at the district level, the relationship is more tense. Different levels of government held different judgments about the success or value of Karuna Trust. This is based on bureaucratic obstacles but also the removal of certain authority structures within different levels of local government. The majority of DSS's contractual interactions were with local government until a recent contract with the state government. DSS is engaged with local government in a variety of ways as they are working within government schools to improve the quality of education and within their own (i.e. DSS) schools to integrate children into government schools. Shelter is engaged in relationships with various levels of local government in Pune and Sangli that is greatly dependent upon the particular relationship between the head of Shelter and individual government officials, bureaucratic and elected.

In the Bangladesh cases, a complex bureaucracy of local government institutions is engaged with each NSP. In the PSTC case, different levels of government offices are working with PSTC either directly or indirectly through the second phase of the project alongside four donors and the Ministry of Health. There are tensions between different levels of government in the FIVDB and UST cases. In the FIVDB case, there is confusion in overlap of different government agencies and a sense of feeling threatened on the part of field level officials. In the UST case the varied levels of government are collaborating on the CLTS programme although there is some resentment within one of the agencies as they feel their role has been diminished in favour of UST.

NSP origins and values of 'public action'
The foundational values, mission and/or vision and the meanings organisations ascribe to 'public action' and/or development objectives condition an organisation's overall agenda as well as relationships with other organisations. The literature does not use the term 'public action' although it is insinuated through the articulation of the NSPs commitment to a particular set of principles and actions working with community members. The literature maintains that the initial values and ideological framework remains embedded within an organisation even though inevitable compromises occur. However, there is a dearth of literature attributed to the significance of the vision of public action. The WPA research contributes significantly to the literature on NSP-government relationships by focusing on the organisations' visions of public action. One of the predominant focus areas within each NSPs in the WPA case studies is the involvement of poor members of the communities. This is also under-represented in the literature; the WPA research contributes to this area in the literature as well.

In Pakistan, the vision of 'public action' for ITA is to provide all actors with the potential to contribute towards education and work together to provide technical solutions to educational challenges. ITA organises group meetings to mobilise communities to send their children to school. Some members of the community are requested to form a group to monitor the working of the schools in which ITA is intervening. Community members are not involved in relationships decisions between ITA and the government. In the PRSP case, community participation is seen as important for monitoring of the staff at the BHUs and has been important in improving services. PRSP has a vision that communities should be mobilised for self-help and linked to government line

departments. Although PRSP emphasises community mobilisation, their belief is that communities need to be led. The vision of the BHU was a deviation from the overall organisational philosophy where the emphasis was that the NSP could help the government understand how best to improve the management of government services. For OPP, the vision of public action is centred within the community; unleashing the latent energies within the community and making it exert pressure on the state to meet community needs while being equipped with possible solutions. The ideology is that communities know both their own problems and solutions but that it lacks technical know-how to turn their local knowledge into technical solutions. OPP sees its role as to provide the community with the technical expertise so the community can then lobby for itself to deliver given that it is in the position to provide effective implementation strategies. For OPP, community mobilisation means that the community is actively involved in all of OPP's activities including those as part of the relationship and lobbying to the government to listen to OPP's proposals and to address the problems faced by the community.

In all cases in India, the vision of public action is influenced by personal experiences, skills and knowledge interests of the founding leader of the NSP; choosing to work directly with the most marginalised groups in society, emphasising 'empowerment' sustainability is not only on improving the system but also on enabling the communities to access services. The vision of public action for DSS is to fulfil the valued right of all children to be in schools. DSS has a continual presence with the communities in which it works, they see themselves as the guardians of the children. Shelter values the dignity of humans and an equitable distribution of resources. Both DSS and Shelter in particular have hired predominantly local workers from communities they are working in. They are both also active in other issues based on the needs of the communities such as housing rights. Karuna's vision of public action is based partly with a particular Hindu philosopher and an equitable model of health case and empowerment for a 'self-reliant, progressive and united tribal communities'. Karuna is committed to community participation through village health committees, 24-hour service with staff living on the premises, gender sensitive care and a health monitoring system.

The vision of public action for FIVDB is inspired by a Freirean view of a need-based and appropriate education that contributes toward educational socio-economic empowerment of disadvantaged women, men and children. FIVDB's primary strategies are to promote 'community mobilisation for networking with government and non-government structures for governance and improvement in service provisions and advocacy for policy changes in favour of disadvantaged communities'. FIVDB is a 'locally grown' NGO. PSTC's vision of public action is rooted in the activities that it conducted in the past while it was functioning as FPSTC. The focus of its public action is "health, security and living conditions" and the target is the "disadvantaged and poor people" of Bangladesh. PSTC's targets their work with the urban poor. UST's vision of public action is based on advocacy, sustaining the poor and working exclusively with women's groups in disadvantaged communities to empower them toward self-reliance. UST is also geared to support government and the overall policy objectives of complete sanitation by 2010.

Internal management of NSPs and government agencies
The literature argues that understanding the internal power dynamics, management and decision-making processes of NSPs and government agencies is important to understanding the dynamics of relationships. In spite of the comparative advantage claim that NSPs tend to be less hierarchically managed than government agencies, the literature indicates that NSPs are not necessarily democratic within their own institutions; rather it is common that they are authoritarian, competitive, classist and elitist.   There are few systematic analyses of internal governance structures and

decision-making processes. The WPA research was also not able to examine organisations from the inside due to a lack of time and resources. However, a sense of the internal management structures in each case study was gathered through the research process.

The NSPs in all of the WPA case studies have some level of hierarchical management in place to lead the organisation. In the Pakistan case studies, individual leadership is particularly significant for the management of the NSP. Staff at ITA is inspired to learn from the leader of the organisation but are also aware that the networking that is inherent through ITA can lead to more lucrative jobs. PRSP staff benefit from a publicly acknowledged successful project and staff at OPP are motivated by the learning opportunities, strong networking opportunities and the flexibility of work hours.

In the India case studies, the 'good governance' in terms of internal management is important to all three NGOs and are characterised by a small core management team, although DSS and Karuna have a large team at the field level. Karuna field staff made up of many local doctors and Shelter and DSS staff are trained in community development and based on experience rather than professional qualifications. In each case Board is passive and not very visible. In all three cases, staff can innovate with little interference from the leader and decision-making tends to be verbal to facilitate quick action.

In Bangladesh, the NSPs from the three case studies each have a three-tier government structure including an executive board, general council or governing body and programme or senior management teams. This structure reflects the management recommendations that exist in NSP legislative frameworks. Whilst there is effort to make decisions in a horizontal manner in FIVDB, UST has become increasingly hierarchical as it has grown and decision-making at PSTC is characterised through consensus in the Programme Management teams.

Boundaries
The literature indicates that a primary issue of NSP-government relationship is that of the definition of boundaries – of the organisations themselves, between civil society and the government, within and between networks, coalitions and alliances of various organisations, and dimensions of the NSP-government relationship. Pettigrew (2003) goes so far as to describe relationships between different organisations as the ultimate post-modern organisation. The boundaries of organisations may change shape temporally and spatially in any given context. The issue of civil society is an important theoretical issue in the literature, but was acknowledged as a peripheral rather than central issue in the WPA research study. The fluidity and ambiguity of boundaries within the WPA case studies is largely a facet of the role of the leaders of the NSPs; without systematic analyses of the internal dynamics and structuring of the organisation in accordance to individual staff alliances (i.e. Elyachar 2000 and Hilhorst 2003) it is difficult to depict and boundary fluctuations. Tvedt (2006) usefully describes the tendency for 'elite circulation' to occur between individual leadership of government agencies, NSPs and donor agencies. This phenomenon of 'elite circulation' was recognised in the PRSP and ITA case studies in Pakistan.

The majority of literature relevant to NSP-government relationships argues that all NSPs are affiliated with wider networks that directly and indirectly influence their relationships with government agencies. Alliances and networks that are associated with NSP-government relationships may include international, national and local NSPs. The varied 'layers of NSPs' reinforce the multi-dimensionality and complexity of NSP-government relationships and their associated networks and alliances. The WPA research examines and defines particular boundaries of each NSP-government

relationship under study, particularly the various networks and alliances associated with the relationship. Hilhorst's (2003) ethnographic study is the most relevant, for the purposes of the WPA research, examining the internal dynamics of NSPs and their associated networks, including relationships with government agencies.

The WPA research contributed to the literature by outlining and mapping the networks, alliances and coalitions linked to the NSP and government in the relationship under examination in each case study. In Pakistan, networks were influential in each case study, but at different levels. Whilst the ITA network consists of other NSPs, donors and government officials, PRSP is part of the broader Rural Support Programme network across Pakistan and OPP's networking is primarily concerned with community members and other like-minded members of civil society as advocacy networks are central to the work of OPP. In India, the cases appear to be less influenced by networks in their overall agenda. Shelter is concerned with local community networks whilst DSS is involved with an NGO network that has been divided over whether to work with the central government. In Bangladesh, FIVDB lobbies and advocacy through NGO coalitions and networks and UST works to build networking, alliances and partnerships with other actors. These actors are drawn both from inside and outside the community where UST works.

Key individuals and leaders

Several sources in the literature argue that the founding and development of NGOs can often be attributed to a selection of key individuals who often have charismatic qualities. Although context is important as it structures actions at an organisational level, it does not determine NSP-government relationships. Rather, individual actors are critical as active agents determining all aspects of relationships of NSPs with different levels of government, donor agencies, other NSPs and civil society organisations. Ramanath's (2005) comparative study of three NGOs in Mumbai is the most valuable study that examines the evolution of NGOs, their internal dynamics, the central role of individuals and associated networks as conditioning dynamics within NSP and government relationships. The founding and development of NSPs are often attributed to the key individuals with charismatic qualities leading to different attitudes, behaviours and interactions between NGOs and government and associated networks and alliances.

The WPA research contributes to the literature emphasising the key role of leaders by examining the role of key individuals and leaders through the evolution of the NSP alongside and simultaneous to the evolution of the relationship between the NSP and government agencies. The role of key individuals and leaders were strong conditioning factors in each of the case studies. The leader of ITA is actively involved with donors and the government through an engagement with state policy planning. She is also a DFID consultant for the PPP cell. In the OPP case, the ideological view of the leader founded the organisation and has kept it in check over the years; it is now a model programme internationally for high technologically and low spending. Political leadership was central to the PRSP case, establishing the initiation (involvement of bureaucrats) and success of the project and its consequential discontinuance. In the India cases, leadership is in the hands of one individual. In the DSS case, the leader of the organisation is very well respected in the communities, schools and local government for her determined yet passive approach. The leader at Shelter is a dynamic and well-respected woman in the communities and by government officials. In the Karuna case, the leader of the organisation is well-respected across the state and at the national level. The leader brought about the principles embedded within the previously established organisation (VGKK) that was working with tribal populations to the principles of Karuna. Charismatic leadership in the Bangladesh were slightly less influential than in the other cases. In the FIVDB case, the leader wants to maintain a

low profile which is sometimes a problem of discontentment in the organisation as some staff wants him to exert more power. However he is widely respected; there is tension that the leadership maintains quality, honesty, credibility and respect when the organisation begins to grow The founding leader of UST had a very specific vision of public action working exclusively with women to change power dynamics in the community. Although he is no longer the head of the organisation, he still holds a great deal of influence

Agendas for public action
The key issues identified within institutional and organisational conditioning factors contribute to explaining the 'agendas' for public action that NSPs and government bring to a relationship with each other. The literature highlighted several key issues as representative of the agenda of engagement: *pre-conditions for successful collaboration, incentives for collaboration* and *the design of the relationship.*

Locating the incentives for each organisation to participate in the relationship is a primary concern of the WPA research. The WPA research is looking not only at financial incentives, but also ideological and other non-material incentives. The WPA research is also exploring how incentives have changed over time. There were only two sets of empirical studies focusing on conceptualisations of public action as determining factors influencing the dynamics of NSP-government relationships, Welle (2001, and the articles by Batley, Moran, Palmer, Rose and Sansom (in 2006). The WPA research greatly enhances this gap in research on NSP-government relationships.

The incentives for NSPs and government agencies to collaborate in providing basic services include a broad range of material and non-material features that are historically and contextually specific. The literature provides a range of recommendations for what pre-conditions might be necessary to establish 'successful' collaboration between NSPs and government agencies. Several highlight the importance of the dynamics of the design of the relationship as establishing the precedent for the success or failure of the relationship as it evolves. Lewis's (1998) ethnographic study of a multi-organisational partnership in Bangladesh is valuable to understand how the dynamics of NSP-government relationships influence the level of success in a partnership, with particular emphasis on communication.

As discussed in the literature, incentives for NSPs and government agencies to engage in a service providing relationship varies across each organisation. It appears in all nine of the case studies that key incentives of the NSPs to work with the government is driven by their vision of public action and a corresponding trust by government agencies that this is indeed what drives the NSP they are working with. In Pakistan, the three NSPs respond to different motivations, driven by the leader of the organisation (ITA and PRSP) and community needs (OPP). Government agencies in Pakistan participating in relationships with each of the NSPs are convinced by the level of commitment (OPP), trust the individual leaders of the NSP (all three cases) and are dependent on the technical knowledge provided by the particular NSP (all three cases). In the India case studies, the primary incentives for DSS, Shelter and Karuna to work with the government are in response to community needs and secondly to influence the government. The incentives for the government to work with each NSP is based on being convinced by the commitment of each organisation to work closely with marginalised members of communities (all three cases), the technical knowledge provided (Shelter) and a general sense of trust of the leaders of the organisations. In Bangladesh, each of the NSPs aims to complement the work of the government. UST and FIVDB are particularly motivated to work with closely in response to the needs of the local communities. Government motivation to work with the NSPs seems to be

influenced through contracts won through a bidding process (PSTC and FIVDB) and donor contracts (UST), although in each case, government agencies are also convinced by the commitment to each NSPs commitment to their vision of public action.

Pre-conditions for successful collaboration
The literature argues that pre-conditions for successful collaboration are based on trust, shared values, perceived comparative advantages and multiple support networks. Although the WPA research does not set out to prescribe a check-list of pre-conditions for successful collaboration in NSP-government relationships, the themes emerging from the case studies agree with the arguments provided by the literature. However, what is most crucial is how different these characteristics look in different case studies; various aspects related to context and history are of primary significance. Where relationships have failed appears to be because of a lack of knowledge of the context by the government and an unwillingness to provide flexibility in the words of the contract (FIVDB) or political recognition not shared (PRSP).

3.3 Nature of relationships

The nature of NSP-government relationships is the primary unit of analysis in the WPA research, implying an exploration of the methods, modes and strategies of interaction. The WPA research examined the vertical, formal, contractual arrangements of the relationship and the horizontal, informal interactions occurring between different individuals within the relationship as well as within networks and alliances associated with the relationship. The key issues identified and discussed in the literature as representative of the nature of the relationship between NSPs and government agencies are *dimensions of NSP-government relationships, roles of participants, interactions and dynamics, formal and informal, methods, modes and strategies, accountability* and *autonomy/room for manoeuvre.*

The literature indicates that there are multiple dimensions through which relationships can occur between NSPs, different levels of government, other NSPs and donor agencies. Nelson's (2006) framework suggests six different dimensions of relationships (i.e. *interpersonal, technical, cultural, financial, legal* and *political*) to examine interactions between donor agencies and NSPs, whereas Sood (2000) employed four dimensions based on *issues, financial, organisational* and *policy.* Matlin's (2001) discussion of organisational and sectoral domains in which interactions occur between the state, the market, NGOs and civil society, is a useful overview of potential conflicts over roles of advocacy and service provision. The WPA research does not explicitly explore dynamics in the different dimensions of the relationships, although this could be expanded upon in a different method of examining the data.

Roles of participants: advocacy/service delivery and contractor/partner
Much of the literature claims that NSPs often simultaneously carry out service delivery, advocacy and/or policy dialogue activities through a range of relationships. The roles that NGOs, different levels of government, donor agencies and associated network organisations play in a relationship over time are important to understanding the dynamics of the relationship. Several sources differentiated between service delivery and advocacy roles performed in NSP-government relationships. One emerging theme from the case studies that is a particular and significant contribution is on the twin roles of advocacy and service delivery that the majority of NSPs are simultaneously engaged in. The nuances, strategies and tactics of advocacy alongside service delivery in the WPA cases challenges Matlin's (2001) claims of antagonism and contributes to Ramanath's detailed evolution of the varied advocacy and service delivery roles of three NGOs in Mumbai.

In the literature, Ramanath (2005) found that NGOs evolve from advocacy to that of service delivery – although strategies and tactics change of advocacy over time. She also found that the notion of service delivery is as multi-farious as advocacy, service delivery exists through a variety of tools – balancing of programmatic with institutional objectives, cajoling bureaucratic and political elites, inviting and retaining and governmental competency, creating and sustaining internal consensus for change and mobilising sufficient financial resources. The diversity of service delivery tools was observed through the detailed examination of the evolution of the NSP-government relationships in each of the WPA case studies.

Dorman (2001) distinguishes between different tactics of advocacy: *passive resistance* (empowerment through alternative strategies); *collaboration* (working closely with ministries but with little interest in changing policy); *entryism* (attempting to penetrate the state machinery to influence policy directions from within); and *opposition* (protests, high-profile appeals, demonstrations). Ramanath (2005) discovered a combination of multiple advocacy interactions that was constantly shifting amongst different *strategies* and corresponding tactics: *Acquiesce* - habit, imitate, comply; *Compromise* - balance, pacify, bargain; *Avoid* - conceal, buffer, escape; *Defy* - dismiss, challenge, attack; and *Manipulate* - co-opt, influence, control. Amongst all nine of the WPA case studies, none of the NSPs engage in direct oppositional/confrontational advocacy tactics. Although several engage in advocacy that exudes defiance and manipulation, these tend to be buffered through modes of passive resistance.

In Pakistan, advocacy is a key part of the relationship in two of the NSPs although the strategies and corresponding tactics look very different. For ITA, advocacy is primarily a strategic combination of compromise (balance and bargaining) and manipulation (influence and control) through active lobbying and entryism style policy planning with government and donor agencies and civil society organisations through seminars and workshops (nationally and internationally) , meetings and informal discussions. The leader of ITA places the onus on herself to network with various agencies and rather deftly avoids confrontation with individuals and organisation posing possible challenges to the furthering of their work by avoiding contact and re-designing projects. Advocacy is central to all of OPP's work through strategies of defiance (challenge), compromise (bargain) and manipulation (influence and control) that cleverly avoids direct confrontation through avoidance processes of concealment and buffering. OPP liaises with other like-minded advocacy and activist groups and mobilises communities to put demand directly on the government. OPP is passively resistant, opposition is not directly confrontational with the government, rather it is buffered through networks and community members. This brings up boundary ambiguity between OPP as a separate organisation from the community. PRSP does not prioritise advocacy although since the termination of the project they have lobbied with the government through bargaining mechanisms to allow the project to continue.

In India, for DSS, direct service delivery intervention is their first priority with advocacy objectives to influence the government a close second. DSS acquiesces with the government through compliance and compromise (balance and bargaining) in the work they do in their own schools to mainstream children into government schools (although they also challenge government by using some of their own curriculum) and aim to manipulate influence on the government to recognise the rights of slum-dwellers through example (passive resistance and to a certain degree, entryism). Similar to DSS, Shelter prioritises service delivery as its core objectives although simultaneously engages in various types of advocacy to influence the government using all of Ramanath's key strategies: acquiescence (complying with slum and sanitation policies), compromise (bargaining for experimentation with experimentation with

individual toilet blocks rather than community toilet blocks); avoidance of direct confrontation (buffering community work through local community workers); defiance (challenging government models of housing and sanitation through technical expertise and informal relationship-building) and manipulation (influence through GIS mapping and sanitation experimentation). Shelter also conveys a passive resistance although works very closely with different levels of government through methods that reflect certain degrees of entryism. Karuna Trust also acquiesces with the government through compliance of health policy objectives, bargaining for further recognition of the rights of minorities (i.e. tribal groups) and defiance and manipulation through influencing tactics of establishing community-driven health project that extend far beyond the normal provision offered by the government. Karun Trust also exhibits a passive resistance in its advocacy work.

In Bangladesh, FIVDB engages in passive but resistant advocacy as a component of its vision of public action that exhibits all of Ramanath's key strategies: acquiescence (complying with contractual obligations and expectations); compromise (bargaining with government agencies with aspects of the contract that do not fulfil community needs); avoidance (keep a low, if not concealed profile on the part of the leader of FIVDB); defiance (dismissing some of the contractual expectations to respond to the needs of the communities) and manipulation (influencing policy planning and implementation through NGO coalitions and networks). PSTC does not engage in explicit advocacy as it collaborates with the government and does not engage in tactics that aim to change or challenge government policy. UST strongly believes in the importance of advocacy in terms of how they work with communities but also in advocacy through support networks for the sector of sanitation to be taken more seriously. UST acquiesces with the government and donors by complying with the terms of the MOU that are in opposition to its vision of public action. However, UST continues to challenge deeply embedded cultural power dynamics in communities by working with women in defiance of donor objectives in its other programmes. UST also aims to manipulate sanitation work by influencing its importance within policy domains.

In addition to the roles of advocacy and/or service delivery, two of the WPA research case studies in Bangladesh (PSTC and FIVDB) and one of the case studies in India (Karuna) focused on the significance of the perceived role of the NSP as either a 'contractor' or 'partner' of the government. This tension was not as apparent in any of the Pakistan or the other case studies in India. The discrepancy between the identity of 'contractor' or 'partner' was also noted by Kumar (2004) in the literature in that NGOs desire contracts but do not want to be referred to as 'contractors'. Pereira (2005) on the other hand notes that NGOs can act both as challengers through their advocacy work and contractors through their contractual requirements. The combined roles of advocacy and service delivery as briefly described above in each of the case studies appear to reinforce Pereira's claims. In the WPA case study on Karuna Trust, they did not want to be referred to as 'contractors' as they saw it as synonymous with 'corruption'. In the first phase in the PSTC case in Bangladesh, the contract stated that the NGO was a 'contractor' which PSTC was not comfortable with. The wording of the contract was changed in the second phase to 'partner'. However, the mindset and treatment of the NGO did not change, in fact the relationship became more rigidly defined from the first to the second contract. FIVDB experienced a similar contradiction in the working of its contractual arrangements.

Formal and information interactions
Interactions between government and NSPs tend to be formalised in some capacity (in contracts or some other written form), although there are simultaneous and continuous additional informal modes of contact associated with the organisation's alliances and networks, particularly through key individuals within the organisation. The literature

indicates that formal and informal interactions occur simultaneously and are often antagonistic to each other (e.g. collaborative and conflictual). Pettigrew's (2003) action research on a multi-organisational partnership provides a useful overview of the interplay between formal (i.e. 'front-staging') and informal (i.e. 'back-staging') interactions that simultaneously occur within partnerships between different organisations, including NSPs and the government. The WPA research case studies contribute to these findings within the literature; each case study exhibited a simultaneous combination of different forms of formal and informal types of interactions.

In Pakistan, ITA engages with government and donor agencies through a broad range of formal contractual arrangements. Many of the informal relationships the leader of ITA has established with members of government and donor agencies are embedded with such a level of trust that relationships have become formalised to a great extent, beyond that of a written contract. OPP does not engage in any written contracts with government or donor agencies. OPP finds formal contracting too confining and challenging to its vision of public action. In the early stages of OPP's existence, OPP initially entered into a tri-party agreement with the government and a donor but based on these experiences has not agreed to engage in a contract again. Interviews with OPP demonstrated that the partnership with the government was a result of constant innovation and improvement of the OPP-RTI model over time in response to community needs. For PRSP, the relationship with government agencies are based on a formal contractual arrangement of an MOU signed by two parties; the same template was used when the partnership was replicated in different districts. The contract binds PRSP but does not explicitly bind the commitments of the government, only 'if possible' rather than an absolute commitment.

In all three cases in India, the government and NSP initially developed activities independent of each other with no plans of engaging with each other. Points of informal interactions emerged with some formalisation of contractual partnership at various points in time. In all three cases, the NSPs were part of a larger project with the state that involved many NSPs. This evolved into separate projects for each NSP. Each of the relationships were formalised through contractual arrangements. Contracts are brief in content and direction and not very explicit in terms of outcomes. As the experience with partnership grows, it seems that the contracts have become more defined, particularly in health and sanitation.

All three of the cases in Bangladesh involved contracts obtained by the NSPs through a competitive bidding process. FIVDB has engaged in contractual relationships with government agencies in Bangladesh since 1994 and the amount of formal contracting since then has increased with the gaining popularity of the PPP policy agenda. In the relationships under examination, FIVDB went through a competitive bidding process amongst many other NGOs in the HTR project. In the CEP contract on the other hand, the relationship between FIVDB and government agencies is governed by the rules in the contract with DFID on the CEP project. The contract with DFID is more flexible and less formal (no bureaucratic structure) in the CEP project whereas in the HTR project that directly involves the government, the relationship is rigid and managed through a complicated bureaucratic structure. Similar to the HTR project that FIVDB is participating in, PSTC is participating in a contract that directly involves with government and was obtained through a competitive bidding process. The PSTC contract also contains strict rules and regulations for each of the NSPs to follow. The formal contractual arrangement the UST is focused on in CLTS is overseen by WaterAid rather than the government of Bangladesh. There is an MOU that is used as a guiding document although the recently distributed second MOU is more explicit in

terms of having a shared vision and mission and the mentioning of several important policies.

In the WPA research case studies it appears that there is a current trend toward a stronger formalisation of the relationship through contracts. In spite of this increasing formalisation however, the dynamics of the relationships are also highly dependent upon the informal aspects of the relationship through key individuals and leaders, networks, alliance and coalitions with various stakeholders organisations and individuals.

Modes and strategies of interaction
There is a broad range of empirical, theoretical and polemical or exploratory literature that analyses the modes and strategies of interaction that each member of an NSP-government relationship draws on. Ramanath's (2005) study rigorously examines the levels of participation, modes and frequency of communication, strategic tactics used by each organisation, and the types of power relations. This has been a valuable guide for the WPA research.

The WPA research case studies investigated the modes and strategies of interaction between the NSP and government agencies in the relationships under study. However, due to a lack of time and resources, these dynamics could not be captured in great detail. Rather, trends and types were located and examined in terms of the primary channels of communication and the clear turning points or 'critical incidents' within each relationship.

Room for manoeuvre and autonomy
Accountability and autonomy are each primary issues within our research. The literature argues that the autonomy an NSP is able to maintain is dependent upon the extent of its commitment to its founding values and vision, the extent of its network of actor and the effects of contracting. 'Room for manoeuvre' is relative to the financial, political and ideological space of the NSP. The literature indicates that accountability is a key issue permeating all stages of NSP-government relationships: accountability of the NSP, the government agency, the donor, other affiliated individuals and partners, and accountability to the poor. The maintenance of organisational identity and autonomy, particularly that of the NSP in NSP-government relationships, is a central issue. Hilhorst's (2003) notion of 'room for manoeuvre' is a useful conception for determining levels of autonomy in the WPA research. Fowler's (1997) detailed discussion of NGOs' struggles for autonomy and identity provides valuable insights for the WPA research. The WPA research contributed to this aspect of the literature and illustrated some of the nuances of autonomy within the evolution of the relationship under examination in each case study.

In Pakistan, the level of autonomy is related to the access to financial resources. When ITA provides financial input, it holds more clout in the relationship than the concerned government agency. However, when ITA implements a government project as a service provider the dominance resides with the government. PRSP was given a great deal of authority in its management of BHUs with a one-line budget. However, the project was terminated unexpectedly, elimination all autonomy for PRSP, because the government felt politically threatened. OPP has no financial flow from the government and therefore has a great deal of autonomy.

In the Indian case studies, the extent of autonomy felt by NSPs is largely dependent on the clarity of its own vision and credibility in the sector which is often represented by the leader of the organisation. Shelter and DSS both seemed to have more room for manoeuvring with credibility perceived by the government. NSPs within each of the

cases have more of a negotiating position because a significant part of the innovations are funded by their own resources, although a delay of funding coming from the government is felt by each of the NSPs. In India it was determined that where the NSP has a monopoly or is among a limited number of players, it is better able to influence the state and incorporate its own agenda into the relationship.

The Bangladesh cases each demonstrate clear challenges to the autonomy of each NSP in the relationship under examination. However, the autonomy of the whole organisation has not been significantly compromised. The NSPs in two of the case studies in Bangladesh demonstrate very little autonomy within relationships bound by government contracts that were acquired through a bidding process (i.e. PSTC and FIVDB). PSTC is constrained by the terms of the contract which are determined by government at the instigation of donors. However, the project did allow PSTC to expand their work with the urban poor in spite of all of the restrictions. The objectives conform to the vision of PSTC and to the MDGs. PSTC has 'learned to live' with the restrictions of the contract so in turn the project is going satisfactorily for PSTC. FIVDB does not encounter any difficulties mainstreaming students into government schools, but they have experienced difficulties with their own 'room for manoeuvring' to accommodate the needs of the communities in which they are working. UST has had to change their vision and thus compromise their autonomy in terms of their approach to working with the community in the sanitation programme.

Isomorphism and path dependency
Ramanath (2005) demonstrated in her doctoral research study that NGOs are far too heterogeneous and complex to become isomorphic to other organisations they are engaged in relationships with. The WPA research case studies further justify Ramanath's (2005) findings. As NSPs expand, they often become more hierarchical and bureaucratic. This is, in many ways, more similar to government agencies than when the NSP was first formed. However, NSPs tend to be path dependent, making decisions that are ultimately in alignment with their founding values and are far too diverse to mirror other organisations like government agencies or businesses.

Path dependency is related to the embeddedness of the founding values and vision of the NSP. The theory argues that although NSPs may show signs of adaptation during their various relationships, it is rare that they lose their identity through any dramatic shifts. In Pakistan and India, all cases demonstrate path dependency, although the PRSP BHU project in Pakistan was terminated abruptly. In Bangladesh, each case illustrates path dependency as well, although UST has had to change its values from working with women-only in their GUP approach to working with CBOs (i.e. both women and men) due to conditions set by DFID and WaterAid. However, UST has only had to change its founding values in this one project; its other projects are still integrated through its GUP approach.

References

Abrahamsen, R. (2004) The power of partnership in global governance, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 8, pp. 1453 – 1467.

Akhtar, A.S. (2002) T*aking the poor for a ride: the PRSP process in Pakistan, A Critical Review of Pakistan Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)*. Islamabad, Pakistan: SUNGI, Action Aid & SDPI Publications

Agge, C. (2006) *Trends in government support for non-governmental organizations? Is the "Golden Age" of the NGO behind us?* UNRISD, Civil Society and Social Movements, Programme Paper Number 23, June 2006.

Atkinson, R. (1999) Discourses of partnership and empowerment in contemporary British urban regeneration, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 36, No.1, 59 – 72

Barnett, M. and Finnemore, M. (1999) The politics, power and pathologies of international organizations, *International Organization*, Vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 699 – 732.

Batley, R. (2004) The politics of service delivery reform, *Development and Change*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 31-56.

Batley, R. (2006a) Guest editor's preface for symposium on non-state provision of basic services, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp.193-196

Batley, R. (2006) Engaged or divorced? Cross-service findings on government relations with non-state service providers, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 241-251

Batley, R and Larbi, G. (2004) *The Changing Role of Government: The Reform of Public Services in Developing Countries*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bebbington, A., Guggenheim, S., Olson, E. and Woolcock, M. (2004) Exploring social capital debates at the World Bank, *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 33-64

Bouget, D. and Prouteau, D. (2002) National and supra-national government-NGO relations: Anti-discrimination policy formation in the European Union, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 22, pp. 31 – 37.

Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Brainard, L. and Siplon, P. (2002) The internet and NGO-government relations: injecting chaos into order, *Public Administration and Development*, 22: 63-72

Bratton, M. (1989) The Politics of Government-NGO Relations in Africa, *World Development* Vol. 17, pp. 569-587.

Brinkerhoff, J. and Brinkerhoff, D. (2002) Government-nonprofit relations in comparative perspective: evolution, themes and new directions, *Public Administration and Development*, 22(1), 3 - 18

Brinkerhoff, D. (1999) Exploring state-civil society collaboration: policy partnerships in development countries, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 1999, Vol. 28; No. 59, pp. 59 – 86.

Brinkerhoff, J. (2002) Government-nonprofit partnership: A defining framework, *Public Administration and Development*. 22(1): 19 – 30.

Brinkerhoff, D. (2002) Government-nonprofit partners for health sector reform in central Asia: Family group practice associations in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, *Public Administration and Development*, 22: 51 – 61.

Brinkerhoff, J. (2003) Donor-funded government-NGO partnership for public service improvement: Cases from India and Pakistan, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 105 – 122.

Brown, L. and Troutt, E. (2004) Funding relations between nonprofits and government: A positive example, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 5 – 27.

Campos, N., Khan, F. and Tessendorf, J. (2004) From substitution to complementarity: Some econometric evidence on the evolving NGO-state relationship in Pakistan, *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 49-72.

Cho, S. and Gillespie, D. (2006) A conceptual model exploring the dynamics of government-nonprofit service delivery, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 493 – 506.

Chouliaraki L. and N. Fairclough. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Chwastiak, M. (1999) Deconstructing the principal-agent model: A view from the bottom, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 10, pp. 425 – 441.

Clark, J. (1997) The state, popular participation and the voluntary sector, in Hulme, D. and Edwards, M. *(1997) NGOs, states and donors: Too close for comfort?* London: MacMillan.

Cleaver, F. (1999) Paradoxes of participation: Questioning participatory approaches to development, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 11, pp. 597 – 612.

Collignon, B. and Vézina, M. (2000) *Independent Water and Sanitation Providers in African Cities Full Report of a Ten-Country Study*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Corder, K. (2001) Acquiring new technology: Comparing nonprofit and public sector agencies, *Administration and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 2, May 2001, pp. 194 – 219.

Cornwall, A. and Brock K. (2005) *Beyond buzzwords: "Poverty reduction", "Participation" and "Empowerment" in development policy*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, UNRISD Overarching Concerns – Paper No. 10, November 2005.

Coston, J. (1998) A model and typology of government-NGO relationships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 358 – 382.

Crawford, G. (2003) Partnership of power? Deconstructing the 'Partnership for Governance Reform' in Indonesia, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 139 – 159.

Davies, J. (2002) The governance of urban regeneration: A critique of the 'governing without government, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 301-322

Dorman, S. (2001) *Inclusion and exclusion: NGOs and politics in Zimbabwe*, D.Phil thesis Department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Oxford.

Edwards (2004) *Civil Society*, Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (1996) Too close for comfort? The impact of official aid on non-governmental organizations, *World Development*, Vol. 24, pp. 961-973.

Elyachar, J. (2003) Mappings of power: The state, NGOs and international organisation in the informal economy of Cairo, *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, p. 571-605

Evans, P. (1996) Government action, social capital and development: Reviewing the evidence on synergy, *World Development*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 1119-1132.

Farrington, J. and Bebbington, A. (1992) *From research to innovation: Getting the most from interaction with NGOs in farming systems research and extension*. International Institute for Environment and Development, Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme, Gatekeeper Series No. 43.

Farrington, J. and Bebbington, A (1993) *Reluctant Partners? Non-governmental organisations, the state and sustainable agricultural development*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Fisher, W. (1997) Doing good? The politics and antipolitics of NGO practices, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 26, pp. 439-464.

Feiock, R. and Jang, H. (2003) *The role of nonprofits in the delivery of local services,* Paper presented at the National Public Management Research Association Meeting, Washington D.C., October 9-10 2003, Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University.

Fowler, A. (1997) *Striking a balance*: A guide to the management of NGOs, Chapter Two: Understanding Development NGDOs, pp. 20-39. London: Earthscan.

Fowler, A. (1998) Authentic NGDO partnerships in the new policy agenda for international aid: Dead end or light ahead? *Development and Change*, Vol. 29, pp. 137 – 159.

Gideon, J. (1998) The politics of social service spending provision through NGOs: A study of Latin America, *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 303-321.

Grindle, M. (2002) *First in the Queue? Mainstreaming the Poor in Service Delivery'*, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, paper prepared for the World

Bank/Department for International Development (DFID) seminar in support of the World Development Report 2004.

Hailey, J. and James, R. (2002) Learning leaders: The key to learning organisations, *Development in Practice*, Volume 12, No. 3 and 4, pp. 398 – 408.

Hajer, M. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Haque, M. (2002) The Changing Balance of Power between the Government and NGOs in Bangladesh, *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 411– 435

Haque, M. (2004) Governance based on partnership with NGOs: Implications for development and empowerment in rural Bangladesh, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 70, No. 2, pp. 271-290

Hastings, A. (1999) Analysing power relations in partnerships: is there a role for discourse analysis? *Urban Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 91 – 106

Henderson, K. (2002) Alternative service delivery in developing countries: NGOs and other non-profits in urban areas. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*, Vol. 2, pp. 99-116

Henry, L. Mohan, G. and Yanacopulos, L. (2003) Networks as transnational agents of development, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 5, pp 839 – 855.

Hilhorst, D. (2003) *The real world of NGOs: Discourses, diversity and development.* New York: Zed Books.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hudock, A. (1999) *NGOs and civil society: democracy by proxy?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hulme, D. and Edwards, M. (1997) *NGOs, states and donors: Too close for comfort?* London: MacMillan

Hulme, D. and Edwards, M. (1997) NGOs, states and donors: An overview, in Hulme, D. and Edwards, M. (1997) *NGOs, states and donors: Too close for comfort?* London: MacMillan.

Ingamells, A. (2006) Community development and community renewal: Tracing the workings of power. *Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal.* 2006. Community Development Journal Advance Access published online on January 12, 2006.

Kamat, S. (2004) The privatization of public interest: theorizing NGO discourse in a neoliberal era, *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 155- 176.

Kapoor, D. (2005) NGO partnerships and the taming of the grassroots in rural India, *Development in Practice*, Vol. 15, Number 2, pp. 210 – 215.

Kilby, C. (1998) *Sovereignty and NGOs*. Vassar College: Department of Economics, New York, USA.

Krishna, A. (2003) Partnerships between local governments and community-based organisations: Exploring scope for synergy, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 23, pp. 361 – 371.

Kudva, N. (2005) *Uneasy relations, NGOs and the state in Karnataka, India*, Paper presented at the Karnataka Conference, ISEC/Cornell University/The World Bank, Bangalore, June 10-12, 2005.

Kumar, L. (2004) *Shifting relationships between the state and nonprofit sector – role of contracts under the new governance paradigm*. ISTR Conference Working Papers, Volume IV, Toronto Conference 2004. Accessed from http://www.istr.org/conferences/toronto/workingpapers/index.html June 2007.

Lewis, D. (1997) NGOs, donors and the state in Bangladesh, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 554, pp. 33 – 45.

Lewis, D. (1998) Development NGOs and the challenge of partnerships: Changing relations between North and South, *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 501-512.

Lewis, D. (2003) Theorizing the organization and management of non-governmental development organizations, *Public Management Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 325 – 344.

Lewis, D. (2004) On the difficult of studying 'civil society': Reflections on NGOs, state and democracy in Bangladesh, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 299-322.

Lewis, D., Bebbington, A., Batterbury, S., Shah, A., Olson, E., Siddiqi, S. and Duvall, S. (2003) Practice, power and meaning: Frameworks for studying organizational culture in multi-agency rural development projects, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 15, pp. 541-557.

Lewis, D. and Opoku-Mensah, P. (2006) Moving forward research agendas on international NGOs: Theory, agency and context, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 18, pp. 665-675.

Lister, S. (2000) Power in partnership? An analysis of an NGO's relationships with its partners, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 12, pp. 227-239.

Lister, S. and Nyamugasira, W. (2003) Design contradictions in the 'New Architecture of Aid'? Reflections from Uganda on the roles of civil society organisations, *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 93-106.

Lorgen, C. (1998) Dancing with the state: the role of NGOs in health care and health policy, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 10, pp. 323-339.

MacDonald, S. and Crisp, T. (2005) Acknowledging the purpose of partnership, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 59, pp. 307-317.

Mageli, E. (2005) Exploring the NGO environment in Kolkata: The universe of Unnayan, Chhinnamul and Sramajibi, *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 249-269

Markowitz, L. (2001) Finding the field: Notes on the ethnography of NGOs, *Human Organization*, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 40-47.

Matlin, S. (2001) Partnership challenges, *Compare*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 11-19.

Maxwell, S. and Riddell, R. (1998) Conditionality or contract: Perspectives on partnership for development, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 10, pp. 257-268.

Mayhew, S. (2005) Hegemony, politics and ideology: The role of legislation in NGO-government relations in Asia, *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 727-758.

Mendonça, P. (2004) *Decentralization of Social Policies, State and Civil Society Relationships in Brazil: Towards Synergy?* ISTR Conference Working Papers, Volume IV, Toronto Conference 2004. Accessed from http://www.istr.org/conferences/toronto/workingpapers/index.html June 2007.

Mercer, C. (2002) NGOs, civil society and democratization: A critical review of the literature, *Progress in Development Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 5-22.

Miraftab, F. (1997) Flirting with the enemy: Challenges faced by NGOs in development and empowerment, *Habitat International*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 361-375.

Mohan, G. (2002) The disappointments of civil society: The politics of NGO intervention in northern Ghana, *Political Geography*, Vol. 21, pp. 125-154

Moran, D. (2006) Comparing services: A survey of leading issues in the sectoral literature, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 197-206.

Moyo, S. (2000) *The Interaction of Market and Compulsory Land Acquisition Processes with Social Action in Zimbabwe's Land Reform* Paper presented at the SARIPS of the Sapes Trust Annual colloquium on Regional Integration: Past, Present and Future, Harare Sheraton Hotel and Towers, 24-27, September 2000.

Najam, A. (2000) The four C's of third sector – government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity and co-optation, *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 375-396

Nelson (2006) The Varied and conditional integration of NGOs in the aid system: NGOs and the World Bank, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 18, pp. 701-713.

Osborne, S., Jenei, G., Fabian, G. and Kuti, E. (2005) Government/non-profit partnerships, public services delivery, and civil society in the transnational nations of Eastern Europe: Lessons from the Hungarian experience, *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 28, pp. 767-786.

Oyugi, W. (2004) The role of NGOs in fostering development and good governance at the local level in Africa with a focus on Kenya, *Africa Development*, Vol. XXIX, No. 4, pp. 19-55.

Palmer, N. (2006) An awkward threesome – donors, governments and non-state providers of water and sanitation services, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 231-240.

Pender, J (2001) From 'structural adjustment' to 'comprehensive development framework': Conditionality transformed?, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 39-411.

Pereira, J. (2005) *Against the state, with the state, within the state: The risks of being an NGO in a context of health reform in Santiago and Montevideo*, RC19 paper, University of Texas at Austin – Population Research Center.

Pettigrew, P. (2003) Power, conflicts and resolutions: a change agent's perspective on conducting action research within a multiorganizational partnership, *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, Vol. 16, No. 6, p. 375-391.

Postma, W. (1994) NGO partnership and institutional development: Making it real, making it intentional. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 447-471

Puplampu, K. and Tettey, W. (2000) State-NGO relations in an era of globalisation: The implications for agricultural development in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, No. 84, pp. 251-272.

Ramanath, R. (2005) *From Conflict to Collaboration: Nongovernmental Organizations and their Negotiations for Local Control of Slum and Squatter Housing in Mumbai, India*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.

Rao, N. and Smyth, I. (2005) *Partnership for Girls' education, Oxfam Introduction: Principles and realities*, Oxford, UK: Oxfam.

Raustiala, K. (1997) States, NGOs and international environmental institutions, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 719-740

Robinson, M. (1997) Privatising the voluntary sector: NGOs as public service contractors? In Hulme and Edwards (1997) *NGOs, states and donors: Too close for comfort?* London: MacMillan.

Rose, P. (2006) Collaborating in education for all? Experiences of government support for non-state provision of basic education in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 219-230.

Rossi, B. (2004) Revisiting Foucauldian approaches: Power dynamics in development projects, *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 6, pp. 1-29.

Salamon, L. and Anheier, H. (1996) *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview*, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Sansom, K. (2006) Government engagement with non-state providers of water and sanitation services, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 207-218.

Sanyal, B. (1994) *Cooperative Autonomy: The Dialectic of State-NGOs Relationship in Developing Countries*, Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.

Seckinelgin, H. (2006) The multiple worlds of NGOs and HIV/AIDS: Rethinking NGOs and their agency, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 18, pp. 715-727.

Selsky, J. and Parker, B. (2005) Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31, No. 6, pp. 849-873.

Sen, S. (1999) Some aspects of state-NGO relationships in India in the post-independence era, *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, pp. 327-355.

Skelcher, C. (2004) 'Hybrids: Implications of New Corporate Forms for Public Service Performance', *Paper to the British Academy of Management Conference*, Edinburgh.

Skelcher, C. (2005) *Jurisdictional Integrity, Polycentrism, and the Design of Democratic Governance*, New Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell Policy Press.

Skelcher, C., Navdeep, M. Smith, M. (2005) The Public Governance of Collaborative Spaces: Discourse, Design and Democracy, *Public Administration*, Vol. 83, No. 3, pp. 573-559.

Slater, R. (2001) Local government partnerships in urban management: The case of South Asia, *Local Government Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 79-96.

Slyke, D. and Roch, C. (2004) What do they know, and whom do they hold accountable? Citizens in the government-nonprofit contracting relationship, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 191-209.

Smillie I. 1995. The Alms Bazaar: Altruism Under Fire - Non-Profit Organizations and International Development. International Development Research Centre: Ottawa.

Smillie I. and Helmich K. (eds). 1993. Non-Governmental Organisations and Governments: Stakeholders for Development. Development Centre of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): Paris.

Snavely, K. and Desai, U. (2001) Mapping local government-nongovernmental organization interactions: A conceptual framework, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 245-263.

Sood, P. (2000) *Flowing upstream: The case for co-operative efforts between NGO-state relationships concerning the drinking water crisis in rural Gujarat (India)*, Masters of Arts thesis, Dalhousie University, Nova Scotia Canada.

Stone, M. (1996) Competing contexts: The evolution of a nonprofit organization's governance system in multiple environments. *Administration & Society;* Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 61-90.

Streeten, P. (1997) Nongovernmental organizations and development, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 554, pp. 193-210.

Tappin, E. (2000) *Challenge and change – International capacity building intervention and Tuvalu NGOs*, Harper Adams University College, Newport, UK.

Tvedt, (2006) Policy arena: The international aid system and the non-governmental organisations: a new research agenda, *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 18, No. 5 , pp. 677-690.

Ullah, A., Newell, J., Ahmed, J., Hyder, M. and Islam, A. (2006) Government-NGO collaboration: The case of tuberculosis control in Bangladesh, *Health Policy and Planning*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 143-55.

Wamai, R. (2004) *Recent International Trends in NGO Health System Organization, Development and Collaborations with Government in Transforming Health Care Systems: The Case of Finland and Kenya*, Unpublished PhD doctoral dissertation, Department of Social Policy/Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki Finland

Welle, K. (2001) *Contending discourses on 'Partnership'. A comparative analysis of the rural water and sanitation sector in Ghana*. Occasional Paper, Water Issues Study Group, SOAS, University of London, September 2001

White, S. (1999) NGOs, civil society and the state in Bangladesh: The politics of representing the poor, *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, pp. 307-326

White, G. and Robinson, M. (1998) Towards Synergy in Social Provision: Civic Organisations and the State in *Beyond the New Public Management: Changing Ideas and Practice in Governance*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Wilson, H. (2001) Power and partnership: a critical analysis of the surveillance discourses of child health nurses. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 26 (2), 294-301

Wood, G. (1997) States without citizens: The problem of the franchise state, in Hulme and Edwards (1997) *NGOs, states and donors: Too close for comfort?* London: MacMillan.

Young D. (2000). Alternative models of government–nonprofit sector relations: theoretical and international perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 149-172.

Zaidi, S. (1999) *The development paradigm: papers on institutions, NGOs, gender and local government*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.