



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE FRONTIER RESEARCH: D
AGRICULTURE AND VETERINARY
Volume 14 Issue 4 Version 1.0 Year 2014
Type : Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-4626 & Print ISSN: 0975-5896

Public Private Partnership Models for Women Entrepreneurship Development in Agriculture

By Binoo P. Bonny, A. Prema & P. Rajendran

Kerala Agricultural University, India

Abstract- The paper contributes empirical evidence on the status of Public- Private Partnership models (PPP) for rural women entrepreneurship development through Self Help Groups (SHGs) in agriculture and classifies them based on the concept of value creation. The study was conducted in Kerala, India during 2009-12, where women entrepreneurship development in agriculture through SHGs is rampant. Ex-post facto design was used to collect data from a purposive sample of 1400 from the four regionally representative zones of the state. Weighted score and case study methods were used in the selection and classification of the delineated models. Study identified 466 women development projects with PPP components. From this 22 cases with working PPP elements were selected for detailed analysis using a weighted score method. Six models with high scores viz Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project, Thirumadhuram Pineapple Project, Uravu RSVY Micro Enterprises Project, Sevashram Organic Producer Company, Subicsha Coconut Producers' Company Ltd and Nendran Banana (Samagra) Project were used for detailed case study. The major public and private agencies involved and focus domains were delineated.

Keywords: value creation, self help groups, women empowerment, social enterprises, public welfare model, private employment model.

GJSFR-D Classification : FOR Code: 970107



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of :



RESEARCH | DIVERSITY | ETHICS

Public Private Partnership Models for Women Entrepreneurship Development in Agriculture

Bino P. Bonny ^α, A. Prema ^σ & P. Rajendran ^ρ

Abstract- The paper contributes empirical evidence on the status of Public- Private Partnership models (PPP) for rural women entrepreneurship development through Self Help Groups (SHGs) in agriculture and classifies them based on the concept of value creation. The study was conducted in Kerala, India during 2009-12, where women entrepreneurship development in agriculture through SHGs is rampant. Ex-post facto design was used to collect data from a purposive sample of 1400 from the four regionally representative zones of the state. Weighted score and case study methods were used in the selection and classification of the delineated models. Study identified 466 women development projects with PPP components. From this 22 cases with working PPP elements were selected for detailed analysis using a weighted score method. Six models with high scores viz Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project, Thirumadhuram Pineapple Project, Uravu RSVY Micro Enterprises Project, Sevashram Organic Producer Company, Subicsha Coconut Producers' Company Ltd and Nendran Banana (Samagra) Project were used for detailed case study. The major public and private agencies involved and focus domains were delineated. Value creation estimated as percentage gains on factors related to income and empowerment for the group members and social and environment gains for the society was used to classify the development models as Public dominated welfare models and Private dominated employment models. Paper establishes the potential of PPP for scaling up entrepreneurship activities in SHGs by convergence of the core assets of public and private sectors. Results also opened possibilities of conceptualization of SHGs as social enterprises and use of PPP strategies in entrepreneurship development.

Keywords: value creation, self help groups, women empowerment, social enterprises, public welfare model, private employment model.

1. INTRODUCTION

The search for alternatives to the privatization of public services to improve efficiency saw the emergence of public-private partnership (PPP) as a policy instrument for development in 1980s. It focused primarily on outsourcing public services to private

operators in the fields of education, health, and infrastructure, and more comprehensive programs of urban and rural economic development that directly engaged both the public and private sectors (Osborn and Baughn 1990; Gerrad 2001). Literature suggests that PPP is an optimal policy approach to promote social and economic development that brings together the efficiency, flexibility, and competence of the private sector with the accountability, long-term perspective, and social interests of the public sector (Richter 2003; O'Looney 1992; Etzioni 1973). Such partnerships blurred the classic distinction between the public and private sectors in a modern economy. They also enhanced the potential for both efficient and equitable production and distribution of social and economic benefits (Larkin, 1994). Advances in information, institutional and welfare economics also contributed to the evolution of PPP as a development tool (Binenbaum et al. 2001; Williamson 1975, 1991; Rangan et al. 2003).

In India, the post liberalization period after early 1990s saw the emergence of PPP as a unique model for development. However, its use as a policy instrument was mostly limited to infrastructure development, health, education and information technology. It referred to the long term contractual partnership between the public and private sector agencies, specifically targeted towards financing, designing, implementing and operating facilities and services that were traditionally provided by the public sector. The partners entered into specially designed terms and conditions formalized through signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) agreeable to both and institutionalised through Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). Operationally a broader definition for private sector agencies has been accepted under this which includes NGOs from voluntary sector, corporate sector, self help groups, partnership firms, community based organizations and all related agencies. Though such partnerships are found sporadic and uneven in agricultural development, the definition has brought the community based organizations and initiatives at the local level for women empowerment through Self Help groups (SHG) also under the ambit of PPP.

This assumes significance as agriculture is one of the primary economic sectors where the role of women is recognized and pursued for inclusive growth and development in recent years. This is primarily because of the extensive involvement of women in

Author α: Associate Professor, Communication Centre, Kerala Agricultural University, Mannuthy, Thrissur, Kerala, India.
e-mail: binoobonny@gmail.com

Author σ: Associate Professor, College of Horticulture, Kerala Agricultural University, Vellanikkara, Thrissur, Kerala, India.
e-mail: premaakau@gmail.com

Author ρ: Professor (Retired), Regional Agricultural Research Station, Kerala Agricultural University, Pattambi, Palakkad, Kerala, India.
e-mail: drrajendranp@gmail.com

agricultural activities with roles ranging from managers to landless labourers. In India 75 percent of all women workers and 85 percent of all rural women workers are engaged in agriculture (Agarwal, 2003). In over all farm production, women's average contribution was estimated at 55% to 66% of the total labour with percentages, much higher in certain regions of the country. The ascending trends of feminization of agriculture has made the issues of gender development and mainstreaming a key strategy not only for the promotion of equality between men and women, but also for sustainable agricultural and rural development. In fact, women Self Help Groups (SHG) constitute one of the core mechanisms devised to reduce the vulnerability of women in agricultural sector. Micro-credit (saving and lending) and community action objectives to ensure women empowerment formed essential strategies of these SHGs (Hashemi et al. 1996). NGOs and public agencies at different levels are involved in building the capacities of these groups with the main focus on group activities and micro credit. Successful efforts have also been made to build their capacity in entrepreneurship activities like apiculture, mushroom production, vermin composting, goat rearing, ornamental fish culture, and floriculture that can improve their socio-economic conditions. Reports indicate that self help programmes have succeeded in changing the lives of poor women by enhancing incomes and generating positive externalities such as increased self-esteem, decision making capacity and access to resources (Swain, 2007). Development strategies that were tried to make agricultural economy better competitive by reducing poverty, enabling food security, ensuring sustainable management of resources and better empowerment of women farmers include PPP, though in minor accounts. It is in this back drop the paper attempts to delineate the status of PPP models for rural women entrepreneurship development in agriculture and classify them based on the concept of value creation.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Kerala, the southernmost state of India during 2009-12. Details of present status of Public- Private Partnership models and institutional arrangements for gender mainstreaming of agricultural development initiatives through entrepreneurial ventures were collected. For the purpose of data collection, the State of Kerala has been classified into four zones that included the southern coastal zone comprising of the districts of Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam and Alappuzha and the southern high range zone of Kottayam, Pathanamthitta and Idukki districts. The central zone consisted of Ernakulam, Thrissur, Malappuram and Palakkad and the Wayanaad, Kannur, Kazaragod and Kozhikode districts formed the northern zone. A zone wise compilation of women empowerment

programmes implemented in agriculture sector (including crops, dairy, animal husbandry, fisheries, processing and value addition and handicrafts) with the partnerships of development departments, NGOs, Commodity Boards, Banks, Private companies and Multinational corporations with PPP elements was done using a survey instrument developed for the purpose. The purposive sample consisted of 1400 development schemes from the four zones. The collected information was subjected to detailed analysis for identifying types and elements of PPP. This could identify 466 projects in agriculture sector with PPP components from the four zones of Kerala. But many of the identified cases either did not have a working PPP element nor had the partnerships dysfunctional at the operational level over time. Therefore, the detailed study was confined to 22 cases from the four different zones where a definite PPP component was involved either in formal or informal way at the time of study. This was ascertained by quantitative assessment of the PPP elements using a weighted score method involving score card that rated it on functionalities of PPP. The functionalities of PPP studied were initiatives in training and technology support, input supply, value addition and marketing. The weighted score for each model was obtained by multiplying the number of activities taken up with PPP components by the model for women entrepreneurship development to its coverage (Score for coverage of PPP model with jurisdiction at Block Level-1, District Level-2, State Level-3, National Level-4). The 22 selected models were subjected to detailed case study on seven major domains of PPP so as to get comprehensive information on management of PPP chains and its outcome. The selected domains included title and organizations involved, theme area of activity, broad objectives, risk sharing practices, stake of different partners (primary and secondary partners), risk taking mechanisms, resources provided by the partners, sharing of responsibilities, financial proprietary, production and distribution of services/ products, sharing of benefits (as per provision of resources and quantifiable or non-quantifiable benefits shared) and outcome (profit or changes in socio-economic lives of the people involved). The management of PPP chain was evaluated on parameters related to resource management and control, communication, coordination among partners, conflict resolution, transparency of system, feedback mechanism, period of operation and flexibility in planning.

Classification of the models based on value creation estimated on factors related to economic and empowerment gains for the group members and social and environment gains for the society was also attempted. Value creation goes beyond profit and stressed social impact and utility of the activities under taken for the society after accounting for the resources used in the activity, It included the extent to which the

group derives benefits in terms of income, employment, increased customer loyalty and markets. Whereas value appropriation allowed the focal actors involved in the activity to capture and share the value created by the activity. The identified models followed different strategies in balancing these mutually exclusive goals of value creation and appropriation. Separate survey instruments were used for SHG members and community members. Economic gain in terms of percentage improvement in income, employment and other incentives received for the group members that ranged from 1 -100 % was measured quantitatively. Upto 10% improvement was given a score of 1, 11-25% (2), 26-50 % (3), 51-75 % (4) and 75- 100% (5). Women empowerment as part of PPP intervention has been operationalized as a function of six dimensions viz. Social participation, political consciousness, information and resource access, improvement in decision making skills and improvement in cognitive ability and skills. Accordingly empowerment gains were measured in terms of improvement in social participation, political consciousness, information and resource access, decision making and gain in knowledge and skill (Pitt et al. 2006). Perception of the members of the community other than group members with respect to local resource utilization, safe to eat standards of food production, resource recycling and environment conservation practices followed by SHGs rated on a three point continuum of 0, 1 and 2 for negative, neutral and positive responses were used to evaluate value creation for the society.

Table 1 : Weighted Scores of the Selected PPP Models from Kerala, India

Sl. No	Name of the PPP model	District of operation	Zone	PPP Score
1	Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project (CCRP)	Thrissur	Central	28
2	Nutrifood	Kasargod	Northern	18
3	Thirumadhura m	Ernakulam	Central	26
4	Kondattom (Samagra)	Palakkad	Central	22
5	Saphalam (Samagra)	Palakkad	Central	20
6	Plant N Plenty (Tissue Culture Unit)	Palakkad	Central	9
7	Samagra Goat Village	Kannur	Northern	18
8	Ornamental fish project	Ernakulam	Central	9
9	Ksheerasagara m (Samagra)	Idukki	Sothorn High range	18

10	Madhuram (Samagra) Honey	Pathanam thitta	Sothorn High range	14
11	Subicsha Coconut Producer Company Ltd	Kozhikode	Northern	28
12	Sevasram	Ernakulam	Central	26
13	AVT Plant biotech project	Ernakulam	Central	20
14	M/s.Jaimatha Estates	Kottayam	Sothorn High range	18
15	Agri-export zone project	Ernakulam , Thrissur	Central	20
16	Nendran Banana (Samagra)	Trivandru m	Southern Coastal	32
17	Nivedyam (Samagra) Pooja Kadali	Thrissur	Central	24
18	Harithashree (Samagra) project	Malappur am	Central	18
19	Ottappalam Welfare Trust	Palakkad	Central	10
20	Uravu RSVY Micro Enterpris es	Wyanad	Northern	28
21	Organic agriculture programme	Alappuzha	Southern Coastal	21
22	Nature Fresh	Idukki	Sothorn High range	9

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 2 : Details of the PPP Models with Women Empowerment Goals

Sl. No.	Name of the model	Major activities	Major Partners involved			Mode of partnership (with years)
			Public	Private	Others (If any)	
I. Research domain						
1	Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project	Development of Cocoa varieties & agronomic practices, training women for self employment by value addition in cocoa	Kerala Agricultural University, Department of Biotechnology, GOI	Cadbury, India	Nil	MOU (1987-2011)
II. Development domain						
1.	Thirumadhuram-pineapple project	Technical support through training, supply of subsidised inputs & buy back	Poverty Alleviation Mission, State Department of Agriculture	Nadukkar a Agro-Processing company	LSG	MOU (2009-11)
2.	Subicsha Coconut Produce Company Ltd	Entrepreneurship development and self employment	Swarna Jayanthi Gram Swaroasgar Yojana, GOI, CPCRI, CFTRI, IIM, Kozhikode, Govt of Kerala	Subicsha Coconut Produce Company Ltd	LSG, Rubco marketing agency	MOU (2003-11)
3.	Sevasram organic enterprise	Promotion of Organic Products	Coconut Development Board, NABARD,	Sevasram, NGO	KILA	Formal MOU (2000-11)
4.	Samagra-Banana project	Capacity building & skill development for self employment	Rural Business Hub scheme, GOI	Provins Agri Systems	LSG	MOU (2000-11)
5.	Uravu RSVY Micro Enterprises	Common Facilities Centre for bamboo enterprises through training & market support	Rashtriya Sam vikas yojana, GOI, Tribal Welfare Department of Govt. of Kerala,	Uravu Indigeno us Science & Technology Study Centre-NGO, & Eco-link Ltd	LSG	MOU (2004-09)

Based on the weighted scores (Table-1) obtained six PPP models of women empowerment with scores above 25 that reflected high elements of PPP

was selected for detailed study. The selected models comprised of Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project (28), Thirumadhuram Pineapple

Project (26), Uravu RSVY Micro Enterprises Project (28), Sevashram Organic Producer Company (26), Subicsha Coconut Producers' Company Ltd (28) and Nendran Banana (Samagra) Project (32). The selected six models were broadly categorised into two types based on focal thrust on research and development domains (Table 2). Accordingly, Cadbury-KAU Cooperative Cocoa Research Project (CCRP) came under the domain of PPP model with research objectives whereas all the other five were aimed at socio-economic empowerment of women groups through entrepreneurship development. Results from Table 2 indicated the type of activities and major partners involved in the different PPP models. The major Public agencies that fostered private partnership in the state for women empowerment were State Poverty Alleviation Mission (Kudumbasree) of the government of Kerala, Programmes of Government of India, Kerala Agricultural University, Coconut Development Board and State Department of Agriculture. Minor public partners included Central Plantation Crops Research Institute (CPCRI), Indian Institute of Spices Research (IISR), Kerala Institute of

Local Administration (KILA), Department of Bio-Technology (DBT), Central Food Training and Research Institute (CFTRI), Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Kozhikode and National Bank for Agriculture and Rural development (NABARD). The private partners that shared critical responsibilities in pursuing the objectives through formal instruments of partnership were Prowins Agri System, Thiruvananthapuram; Uravu, Wyanadu; Subicsha, Kozhikode; Sevashram, Ankamali; Nadukkara Agro processing Company, Moovattupuzha and Cadbury India Pvt. Ltd, Ernakulam, Eco-Link Wyanad and AV Thomas and Company, Alwaye. An important feature shared by most of these models was the facilitation role served by local self governments and Cooperative marketing agencies like Rubco in its activities. This added a participatory component to the whole process which is seldom found in common PPP initiatives. In order to have a better understanding an attempt has been made to classify the five development models (research model was excluded) based on the value creation processes followed as perceived by members and community.

Table 3 : Value Creation in Development PPP Models

Name of PPP Model	Value creation for the group (n=150) in terms of			Value creation for the society (n=100) in terms of			Average score for the model (%)
	Economic gain (%)	Empowerment (%)	Average for group	Social gain (%)	Environment (%)	Average for society	
Thirumadhuram-pineapple project	72.3	44.67	58.49	58.51	38.49	48.5	53.50
Subicsha Coconut Produce Company Ltd	53.3	35.04	44.17	51.16	23.45	37.31	40.74
Sevasram organic enterprises	49.6	40.65	45.13	30.44	41.46	35.95	40.54
Samagra- Banana project	73.3	56.80	65.05	57.91	44.51	51.21	58.13
Uravu RSVY Micro Enterprises	46.3	45.56	45.93	42.13	26.74	34.44	40.19

a) Classification of PPP Models

Five development models of PPP viz. Subicsha, Samagra, Uravu, Sevashram and Thirumadhuram identified from the state had the triple bottom line objectives of social and economical goals of women empowerment along with local resource use optimization often shared by social enterprises (Haugh, 2007; Martin and Osberg, 2007). However, unlike commercial enterprises, being profitable remained a necessary precondition for these models for achieving their social and environmental goals rather than for economic sharing. Therefore, the distinctive domain of these models and their logic of actions followed could be evaluated only in terms of value creation strategies followed for socio-economic and environmental impact processes for optimizing returns as suggested by Mizik and Jacobson (2003).

In fact, value creation goes beyond economic gains and stressed environmental impact and utility of the activities under taken for the society after accounting for the resources used in the activity. The identified models followed different strategies in balancing these mutually exclusive goals of economics, empowerment and environment. Average economic and empowerment gains in per cent for the group members and socio-environmental gains for the society for the models studied is given in Table-3. The results indicated uniformly higher per cent gains around and above 50% for Samagra and Thirumadhuram models of PPP on value creation dimensions for both group members and society. However, the overall percentage gains of value creation for Subicsha, Uravu and Sevashram models for both group members and society was around 40%, much lower compared to the other two models.

Moreover the value creation gains for group members were uniformly higher than the value creation gains for the society in these models.

The overall percentage gain was used in classifying the selected models into two categories of women entrepreneurship development models. Viz. Public dominated welfare models (Eg: Samagra, Thirumadhuram) and Private dominated employment models (Eg: Subicsha, Uravu and Sevashram). The categorization was based on the identified tradeoffs in terms of the emphasis they place on value creation in terms of income generation and socio-environmental benefits as evident from Table.3

i. *Public Dominated Welfare Models*

Your paper text Samagra- Banana project and Thirumadhuram-pineapple project had 58 and 53% overall gains in value creation with reasonable gains on value creation attributes for both group members and the society. It suggests that though an appropriate level of value appropriation was critical for sustainable growth of all these models dichotomy between value creation and value appropriation was not well defined in these public dominated welfare models. Skewed towards total value creation, these models focused on activities that had high value both for the group and society like organic farming, maintaining safe-to-eat standards in value addition and local resource use. Value appropriation losses on these grounds were compensated through incentives and subsidies through public funding as part of the development schemes. These models had high level of community partnership through Panchayathi Raj institutions, farmer organizations and women self help groups that helped in better resource mobilization and conflict resolutions. Often implemented as part of development schemes, the private partnership component had no formal agreements or MOU but functioned mostly on mutually agreed principles. The programmes were focused on overall capacity development and empowerment through nonformal education strategies. Risk minimization and resource optimization was stressed over profit maximization. However, the public dominated welfare models had less sustainability when compared to the private dominated employment models as the value appropriation strategies mostly depended on public funds. These were mostly push-driven models evolved as part of development programmes initiated by departments rather than felt needs of the beneficiaries. Once the project period was over there were not many backup programmes for the continuation or diversification of the activities under the project and often lost direction and relevance.

ii. *Private Dominated Employment Models*

Private dominated employment models consisted of wage employment models (Eg: Sevashram) and self employment models. (Eg: Uravu,

Subicsha) based on the emphasis they place on value creation and appropriation. Wage employment models were more market oriented and stressed value appropriation retaining value creation at critical levels for achieving social enterprise status. But, the self employment models were more inclined towards value creation for social impact retaining value appropriation at levels sufficient for sustainability and growth.

Functional economic partnership between public and private partners was present as the funding and monitoring of the programmes were done by the Government and implementation by the private partner. They were mostly projects developed based on local need assessments and as such termed as pull-driven models. They had higher level of sustainability as compared to the public dominated models as they tried to stress value appropriation objectives that focussed profit maximization at critical levels of value creation. But most of these models were aimed at capacity development for production related to the market and prices of products were fixed at points that maximized returns. Local self government, the public domain community partners' participation in these private dominated models was limited to social mobilization and legitimization. Social mobilization followed the blanket method of selection of participants and no aptitude tests were conducted for the selection of participants even for skilled enterprises like bamboo crafts which affected the overall efficiency. The lack of skill among the members often created problems in meeting the breakeven point in a given period. Moreover, there was no provision for hand holding support for tiding the initial phase of skill development in the project funding leading to wage employment status of projects like sevashram.

IV. CONCLUSION

The results indicated that many of the women entrepreneurship development programmes had components of public private partnerships through formal and informal modalities. This needs to be strengthened through written published MoU that formalise and ensure transparency in the partnership between the private sector and government institutions. The results also established the potential of PPP to break the inefficient paradigms that separated the public and private sectors. All the identified models had community sector organizations, private business partners and public sector organizations that collaborated, competed and learned to serve marginalized women in agriculture sector. It served beyond the goals of welfare by public domains and profit by private concerns by facilitating the convergence of their core assets through the leveraging support of local administration and community organizations. It also opened up the possibilities of conceptualisation of

SHGs as social enterprises in development. The partnerships enabled product diversification, quality enhancement and convergence of activities of different departments and agencies. Scaling up of enterprise activities to bring economies of scale and ensuring market and employment opportunity for marginalised women could also be ensured in these models. The results proved value creation as an appropriate quantitative parameter in evaluating the SHGs and group enterprises in social sector. Quantification of appropriate threshold levels of value creation for sustainability of groups can open new avenues of research in the area. Moreover, the results proved the tremendous potential of PPP in entrepreneurship development in women SHGs and the need for promoting it as a major policy instrument especially in the context of decentralization. PPP also strengthened the systems of cooperation, collaboration and networking in women SHGs, and it could be promoted in the frame work of a social enterprise that goes a long way in adopting it as a development strategy. Such action includes strengthening the capacity of public institutions and NGOs to improve the knowledge of women's changing forms of involvement in farm and other activities.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Agarwal, Bina 2003. Gender and Land rights Revisited: Exploring New prospects via the state, family and Market. *Journal of agrarian Change*. Vol 3(1&2): 184-224.
2. Binenbaum, E., P. G. Pardey and B. D. Wright. 2003. Public Private Research Partnerships: the consultative Group on International agricultural research. *American Journal of agricultural economics*. 83(3). August 2001: 748-753.
3. Etzioni, A. 1973. The Third sector and Domestic Missions. *Public administration Review* 33, 314-323.
4. Gerrard, Michael, B. 200. Public Private Partnerships. *Finance and development* September 2001 Vol 38 (3).
5. Hashemi SM, Schuler SR and Riley AP (1996), 'Rural Credit Programs and Women's Empowerment in Bangladesh', *World Development*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 635-653.
6. Haugh, Helen. 2007. Community led social ventures creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Vol. 31(2): 161-182.
7. Larkin, R. G. 1994. Public Private Partnerships in Economic development: A review of theory and practices. *Economic Development Review* 12 (91) (Winter 1994): 7-9
8. Martin, R. L. and Osberg, S. 2007. Social entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring): 28-39.
9. Mizik, N. and Jacobson, R. 2003. Trading off between values creation and value appropriation – the financial implications of shifts in strategic emphasis. *Journal of Marketing* 67 (January): 63-76.
10. O'Looney, J. 1992; Public Private Partnerships in economic development negotiating the trade off between flexibility and accountability. *Economic development review* 10(4) (Fall 1992): 14-22.
11. Osborn, R. N. and Baughn, C. C. 1990. Forms of Inter Organizational governance for multinational alliances. *Academic management Journal* 33(3): 503-519.
12. Pitt, M., S. R. Khandker, and J. Cartwright. 2006. Empowering Women with Micro Finance: Evidence from Bangladesh, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 791- 831.
13. Rangan, S; R. Samii and L. N. Van Wassenhove. 2003. Constructive partnerships when alliance between private firms and public actors can enable creative strategies. *Manuscript*. July 2003.
14. Richter, J. 2003. We the people or we the corporations? Critical reflections on UN business partnerships. Geneva IBFAN-GIFA.
15. Swain, Bali R. 2007. Can Microfinance Empower Women? Self-Help Groups in India, *Dialogue*, No. 37, ADA, Luxembourg.
16. Williamson, O. E. 1991. Comparative Economic Organization: The analysis of Discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Quarterly*. 36(2): 269-296
17. Williamson, O. E. 1975. *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Anti-trust Implications*. Free Press, New York.



This page is intentionally left blank