

Abstract

This study identified trust and control, knowledge and resource sharing, proximity, organizational culture and the Jewish factor as essential to collaboration in the Jewish community. The five factors were evaluated in two collaborations between Jewish organizations in Los Angeles. Findings from both collaborations suggest that all five factors played a pivotal role in both case studies. This study found that these five elements are not a comprehensive list of factors essential to collaboration, but are the basis for any Jewish partnership. An original finding of this study was the Jewish factor's role in accelerating the development of the two collaborations. The findings in this paper serve as a foundation for future collaborations in the Jewish community.

operating simultaneously. As highlighted in the previous section, trust and control serve as the foundation and cement of any collaboration. Lasting collaborations require substance beyond trust and control. Knowledge and resource sharing is the substance or bricks that builds collaborations.

The existing research on knowledge and resource sharing is extensive. We found a balance between literature written for the private sector and the non-profit sector. With the exception of current research on IT knowledge sharing, the findings in the private sector are adaptable to the non-profit sector. We decided to exclude the IT research in our study because it is not relevant to collaborations between Jewish non-profit organizations.

Our goal in this section is to provide a clear understanding of the challenges and advantages of knowledge and resource sharing. In this section we will break down the different reasons why organizations share knowledge and resources, the necessary conditions for successful knowledge and resource sharing, and the pros and cons of knowledge and resource sharing.

Why Organizations Share Resources

Organizations often share resources in order to gain resources from their partners. The need to share resources stems from the neoclassical economic concept of 'scarce resources'. According to this theory, scarcity implies that organizations are all vying for the same limited resources, and the only way for organizations to satisfy their objectives is through trade-offs: knowledge and resource sharing. Scholars recognize two primary reasons why organizations share resources: strategic effects and the creation of new knowledge.

sharing (Lane and Lubatkin, 1998; Levinson and Asahi, 1995; Larsson et. al., 1998). London's (2001) theory tied together the above mentioned variables through the three structured steps. He argues that knowledge and resource sharing does not happen immediately and requires planning and strategic decision making. The decision to share knowledge and resources depends heavily on whether it will be beneficial. It is with this idea in mind that we shift our focus towards the pros and cons of knowledge and resource sharing.

Pros and Cons of Knowledge and Resource Sharing

Pros of Knowledge and Resource Sharing

The organizational world has seen a punctuated equilibrium of evolution as a result of the lowering of barriers to information. Today, most organizations cannot keep up with the speed of the changes occurring in their external environment. Many organizations are beginning to realize that their relevancy depends on their ability to keep up with the external organizational market. Collaborating and sharing resources has presented itself as a viable solution to the issues surrounding relevancy. It gives organizations the opportunity to share invaluable skills and competencies (London, 2001). By sharing resources partners create new resources that pave the way for future success. The value gained from sharing resources helps to attract new opportunities that were not previously available (Doz and Hammel 1998). Collaborating organizations progress at a faster speed than the greater organizational market. This places partnering organizations in positions of power that were not available if they had acted alone. With the newly acquired power partnering organizations are now in the position to effectively impact their environment.

Cons of Knowledge and Resource Sharing

There are a variety of dangers associated with engaging in a partnership for the sake of sharing resources. Barney (2001) argues that knowledge and resource sharing can create an environment conducive to competitive advantage. Partners have a tendency to turn into competitors who create a negative spill over from sharing resources. The partner that becomes a competitor will likely use the newly acquired resources to boost their own organization. March (1991) adds that collaborations are inherently competitive and often lead to one organization being left behind. Beyond the effects of competition, sharing resources is an expensive venture (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). Most organizations are plagued by scarce resources and sharing them can be dangerous. Organizations run the risk of investing scarce resources into a failed partnership which could be detrimental to its long-term sustainability.

It is important to acknowledge that sharing resources is a highly complex process. Every collaboration involving the sharing of resources is distinct from one another. While there are variations between collaborations, we identified in this section uniform means for evaluating the process and success of any inter-organizational sharing of knowledge and resources. We assert that all collaborations involving the sharing of knowledge and resource can be evaluated based on the measurements defined in this section.

section will provide a better understanding of how organizational culture is defined, the different types of organizational culture and the criteria for successful integration of multiple organizational cultures.

Organizational Culture Defined

Organizational Culture is a term that emerged in the private sector during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Some scholars suggest that organizational culture is made up of shared beliefs and values which guide the decision making process of an organization (Cooke and Rousseau, 1988; Utaal, 1983). Other scholars place emphasis on the role of language and communication in defining organizational culture (Kecker and Geer, 1970). Martin and Siehl (1983) take an assertive stance by advocating that organizational culture is the foundation of every organization: it is what gives an organization meaning, allows for symmetrical sharing of information and provides a system of rewards for employees. On the subject of rewards, other scholars emphasize the role of organizational culture as a mechanism for shaping group behavior (Swartz and Jordon, 1980; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). Organizations utilize their culture to influence group behavior in order to produce optimal results. An organization can be more effective if all of its employee's behavior is similar because it reduces the chances of conflicting agendas. While it is clear that there is no single definition for organizational culture, each definition provides us with a better understanding of workplace dynamics.

Schein (1991) argues that organizational culture exists in layers. The surface layer or artifacts are those aspects of an organization which are most visible. For example, the artifacts of a grassroots organization might be the young complexion of its employees.

collaboration. This idea is different from when cultures conflict. Cultural dominance can bring great strain on a partnership by causing the less dominant organization to regress.

In order to prevent cultural domination, partnering organizations must work towards cultural integration. The first step to solving a problem requires foresight and leadership to identify the problem. This logic applies to the common-culture approach towards collaboration. In the common-culture approach, organizations work towards integration by recognizing their differences and similarities at the inception of the partnership. By utilizing honest communication, the common culture approach prevents incompatible partners from collaborating (Parker and Selesky, 2004). Not all organizations interact through common-culture methods. In most cases collaborating organizations are forced to negotiate their cultural tensions.

Nahavandi and Malekzadeh (1988) created a model for how to navigate cultural negotiations. They outlined four different ways to achieve acculturation: integration, assimilation, deculturation, and separation. Integration is the ideal mode of cultural adaptation and occurs when partnering organizations successfully combine their cultures. Assimilation transpires when one of the two partnering organizations abandons its own culture and welcomes the partner's culture. Deculturation occurs when all partnering organizations allow for the co-existence of multiple organizational cultures. Separation is the least desirable negotiation mechanism. When partnering organizations encounter separation they do not know how to diffuse tensions caused by cultural differences. As a result, some of the partnering organizations are not willing to fully integrate their cultures. Instead each organization holds

size. It did not seem logical to use a survey for Café Europa and March of the Living or Synaplex because the relatively small sample size (ten people) could provide more information on their respective collaboration through personal interviews. We also concluded that focus groups were unnecessary given the small amount of key players involved in the two collaborations.

Prior to conducting interviews we created key questions. The questions were designed to address four key factors we deemed essential for any collaboration. The four factors included trust and control, knowledge and resource sharing, proximity and organizational culture. These four factors were identified during our extensive literature review process. We created additional questions for our fifth variable the Jewish factor. We started out with 20 original questions for our interviews. Pre-tests were carried out in order to narrow the scope of our questionnaire. These pre-tests were carried out with two of the four previously identified individuals who helped identify the two collaborations. The interview questions were the same for both collaborations. During the pre tests, the individuals provided us with feedback on which questions were and were not essential to our interviews. After the pre-tests were completed, we narrowed the scope of our survey down to 12 questions (Appendix 1).

Case study analysis are the preferred method for presenting the interview findings from both collaborations. We decided to use two separate case studies because it was the best method for providing the reader with necessary background and contextual information about the two collaborations. Also, it was a great method for integrating the information for all of the

interviews in order move forward with our discussion section. Both case studies followed the same structure which included; introduction and objectives, players, history and background, structure and roles, and outcomes and current situation. All of the case studies were based on information that we gathered from the seven interviews.

We extracted methods from our literature review in order to measure the success of each of the four variables in the two collaborations that were evaluated. Within the literature review we identified that in order to determine successful exchange of trust and control the collaborating organizations must 'manage risk effectively, create common goals, adapt to partners' needs and maintain effective communication. In order to determine if both collaborations "managed proximity" well we examined how location effected the collaboration. In order to determine successful knowledge and resource sharing we determined whether the collaborating organizations shared knowledge and resources, managed resource dependency effectively and created new knowledge. In order to determine if the collaborating organizations were successful at managing cultural issues; we identified each organization's culture and evaluated whether there was cultural integration. There were no identified mechanism for measuring the success of the Jewish Factor. The responses' concerning the Jewish factor was used to identify if there are any Jewish aspects that effect collaboration. All five factors will be evaluated in the discussion section of our study.

Limitations

There are a variety of limitations associated with using the selected research design. First, qualitative studies are difficult to repeat. If other researchers desired to repeat our study they

would not be able to copy our results. Interviews take on a particular dynamic depending on the chemistry of the interviewer and interviewee. Also, every researcher has different interviewing experience when conducting an interview. Those individuals who have more interviewing experience would withdraw the highest depth of information from their subjects. This takes us to our second point which is that qualitative studies are vulnerable to observer bias. No matter how hard an interviewer may try he/she will influence their participants' responses. A researcher's presence in the same room as his/her subjects has been known to affect the subjects' behavior and responses. Unlike qualitative studies, a researcher may skew interview results in order to further prove his/her point.

The third limitation of a small project is that the findings are not sufficiently general that they could be extended to other situations. For example, what might allow for successful knowledge and resource sharing in Synaplex will not necessarily be the case for other collaborations within the Jewish community. Another limitation, related to qualitative studies, was the limited scope of our sample size. We initially considered for our study three collaboration models but had to eliminate one of the case-studies due to limited time and resources. Having a small sample size might limit the accuracy and levels of generalization of our findings, because we cannot draw upon a large sample which could permit our results to represent framework for our recommendations and conclusions. Given these limitations we believe that findings from this study are still of great benefit to those organizations seeking collaboration.

Unfortunately interpersonal tensions were detrimental to sharing the consultant, which resulted in the hiring of a second professional.

The interaction between the different elements mentioned in this paper was evident in the case of Temple Aliyha and Temple Judea. Proximity clearly affected the knowledge and resource sharing mainly due to tensions related to observance of Jewish law and interpersonal conflict.

Organizational Culture

In both of our case studies organizational culture played a major role. Organizations compromise in order to adapt and integrate different cultures. Each one of the organizations that we analyzed showed a strong and dominant culture, but the willingness to integrate and collaborate was clearly stronger and no one culture dominated the others.

Though many of those interviewed for this research agreed that compromises had limits, it was clear that all were flexible enough to accommodate partners' needs. In the case of Synaplex, Temple Judea was willing to meet the Jewish legal concerns of Temple Aliyah and Temple Aliyah was willing to meet the liturgical concerns of Temple Judea. In the case of Cafe Europa and the March of the Living, all of the partnering organizations were willing to each others cultural concerns.

Temple Judea, a reform synagogue with a detail oriented style and Temple Aliyah a conservative synagogue with an easy going style. However, this difference was not a barrier

to a successful cultural blend. Furthermore, the success of the collaboration's cultural integration could be seen in the fact that both organizations adopted specific cultural norms of the other.

Jewish Factor

Every collaboration among for-profit or non-profit organizations tends to have a unique characteristic that ultimately becomes a distinguishing factor. This paper is being developed in the context of the Jewish community and the Jewish factor was a key element of the partnerships that were analyzed.

In the case of Synaplex, the Jewish factor played a pivotal role in the establishment, development and success of the program. Concepts like *K'lal Yisrael* ("community of Israel") were used to clarify why Jewish organizations should successfully collaborate.

The March of the Living-Café Europa partnership was based on shared Jewish identities and destinies. The Jewish communal aspect of the program as well as its emotional level added strength to the collaborative. One organizer explained that "it generates a sense of already known assumptions that do not need to be discussed in order to understand your partners." Clearly the influence of the Jewish factor can be highly positive, but as in the case of this collaboration, assuming too much may give rise to later problems.

CHAPTER 7

Discussion

The case analyses of both collaborations presented a series of findings concerning the five factors. In this section, we will expand on our findings by analyzing consistencies between both collaborations for each of the five factors. We will conclude this chapter by discussing how the five factors interacted throughout the duration of both collaborations.

Trust and Control

Trust and control was the most important factor effecting both collaborations. Without trust and control, Café Europa and March of the Living, or Synaplex would not have existed. The successes of both collaborations emphasized the importance establishing trust and balancing trust and control.

Trust was developed between the organizations in both collaborations over time. Past relationships between key players from each of the partnering organizations helped to facilitate trust. In both collaborations, the key players indicated that the partnerships were formed as a result of having past relations. By having past relations, the partnering organizations were able to clearly define shared expectations and ensure transparency. A partnership can be undermined by unclear expectations (Das and Teng, 1998). As seen in Café Europa and March of the Living, and Synaplex, the lack of transparency in roles hurt the development of trust between the partners. In one of the cases the shortcomings involving transparency were prevented because the partners' had strong communication

between one another. Transparency was not ensured in the case where there were communication issues.

Trust is developed when strong lines of communication exist between partnering organizations (Kanter, 1994). All of the collaborations examined had high levels of communication. The two synagogues involved in Synaplex met regularly to finalize the details for their monthly Shabbat programming. JFS-LA and BJE-LA communicated regularly to establish the logistics of their program. Clear communication helped develop commonalities between the partnering organizations (Bijlsma-Fankama and Costa, 2005). Both collaborations involved organizations that were completely distinct from one another. In Synaplex there were two synagogues from separate denominations. Café Europa and March of the Living involved a funding organization, educational organization and social service organization. It was through communication that the partnering organizations were able amend their differences and find common ground. The two collaborations we examined highlighted that trust is established through past relationships and strong communication. The case studies also indicated that maintaining trust in the long-term depends on how well partnering organizations compromise.

Interviewees emphasized that trust was sustained throughout their partnership because of a shared willingness to compromise. Throughout Synaplex, Temple Aliyah and Temple Judea made compromises relating to *halakhah* and proximity. For example, Temple Judea utilized its satellite campus for hosting Synaplex in order to allow Temple Aliyah members to participate without breaking *halakhah*. When constructing the liturgy for the service, Temple

Aliyah encouraged the inclusion of Reform prayer. Without shared compromises, Temple Aliyah and Temple Judea would have felt threatened by their partner's decisions. Compromise allows for partnering organizations to create mutually compatible interests (Das and Teng, 1998). By compromising the partners in Café Europa and March of the Living realized that the program's success was a mutual concern. Compromise is a balancing act, similar to managing the forces of trust and control.

Both collaborations successfully balanced trust and control. As Das and Teng state in their study, integrating the forces of trust and control is important for any collaboration's success. Money acts as the primary mechanism for control in the collaboration (1998). In Café Europa and March of the Living, The Jewish Federation provided the funding for the program. By having control over the money, The Jewish Federation had the power in the collaboration. The Jewish Federation counterbalanced their control because they gained the trust of their partners by empowering them to use their programmatic skills.

As expected, the same balance was achieved in Synaplex. Although Synaplex had a similar funding structure as Café Europa and March of the Living, the two synagogues were not frustrated by the fact that STAR controlled the funding. Both synagogues were grateful for STAR's funding and never questioned how the funds were allocated. Control became an issue when the two synagogues stopped sharing the STAR consultant. The synagogue that continued using the STAR consultant had immediate access to information. At first, the synagogue that stopped using the STAR consultant was dissatisfied with their new dependency. In order to balance trust and control, the two synagogues reestablished their

trust by hiring an additional consultant. Both Café Europa and March of the Living, and Synaplex indicate a positive correlation between trust and control. When one partner increases its level of control, all partners increase their level of trust and confidence.

Knowledge and Resource Sharing

The sustainability of collaboration depends upon how well partners share resources. In order to share resources, partners must establish trust and agree upon common goals (Powel, Koput and Smith-Doer, 1998). As mentioned in the previous section, all of the organizations built trust through their past relationships. In the case of Synaplex, the two synagogues were open to the idea of sharing resources because of the relationship between the two rabbis. Similarly, in the March of the Living and Café Europa, the relationship between the staff of BJE-LA and JFS-LA served as a catalyst for resource sharing. The willingness to share resources is rooted in trust, but the decision to share resources stems from the pursuit of mutual goals.

There are multiple organizations in the field of Jewish communal service; many of them are competing for the same scarce resources. Often, as shown in the two case studies, these organizations are seeking similar agendas. The organizations presented in the case studies, collaborated because they needed their partners' resources in order to create their program. In the case of March of the Living and Café Europa, each partner contributed resources because they wanted to achieve the same desired outcome. As was the case in Synaplex, both synagogues were suffering from declining attendance at Shabbat services and decided to

combine resources in order to attract new members. Once the organizations decided to share resources, they went through a series of steps in order to achieve success.

The initial step involved deciding who would fund each program. In the literature, it was suggested that money is a contentious issue when organizations collaborate (Selsky and Parker, 2005). Given the fact that money is a scarce resource for all of the organizations, it was expected that questions of funding would have a detrimental effect on each partnership. What was shocking in both case studies was the minimal effect money had on either collaboration. In Synaplex, the funding from STAR prevented any issues from arising. The synagogues showed a strong desire to share resources because they did not have to provide their own monetary resources. Café Europa and March of the Living experienced a similar situation because The Jewish Federation provided funding for the program. Issues surrounding money were averted because the funding organizations in both collaborations did not assert control over their partners.

Without funding as an obstacle, all of the organizations were able to share resources successfully. In some cases, organizations, which shared resources successfully, were able to create new knowledge (Powel, Koput, and Smith-Doer, 1998). Knowledge creation occurred during Synaplex when the two synagogues wrote a joint piece of liturgy. This scenario was possible because there were high levels of involvement and embeddedness between both partners (Hardy, 2003). Although the March of the Living and Café Europa had high levels of involvement and embeddedness, they were unable to create new knowledge. Creativity was an essential characteristic that was present in Synaplex, but was not present in Café

Europa and March of the Living. Our analysis suggests that partnering organizations that integrate creativity when sharing resources have a high likelihood of creating new knowledge.

Organizational Proximity

Geographical and organizational proximity effected both collaborations differently. Those partnerships that had clear lines of communication and strong inter-personal relationships were able to manage issues of proximity. In Synaplex, it was the strong relationship between the two clergy members that abated the tensions surrounding the geographical proximity of the services. Without their relationship, the two synagogues would not have reached a compromise, and the program would have eventually failed. Geographical distance had an inverse effect on Café Europa and March of the Living. Minor issues were exacerbated because of the communication challenges presented by geographical proximity. The negative effects of geographical proximity prevented the Israeli counterparts from understanding the purpose of the March of the Living. All of the issues relating to geographical distance were either enhanced or decreased depending upon the strength of organizational proximity.

In both cases, having past relations with a partnering organization helped with organizing the programs. The closeness in geographical proximity allowed for JFS-LA, BJE-LA and The Jewish Federation to partner in the past, and as a result an environment of predictability was established. And being able to predict each others strengths and weaknesses, helped in delegating the appropriate roles for each of the partners. The same conditions were present

in Synaplex. Temple Aliyah and Temple Judea had high levels of organizational proximity because they collaborated in the past. At the beginning of Synaplex, both synagogues were excited about the prospect of the collaboration because they had strong organizational proximity. The findings from both case studies stress the importance of working through issues of geographical proximity by strengthening organizational proximity.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture played an important role in shaping the relationships in the partnerships we examined. The best relationships were built among organizations that were willing to understand and accept their partners' culture (Schein, 1991). This understanding attitude allowed for organizations with completely different cultures like The Jewish Federation, BJE-LA and JFS-LA, to collaborate successfully. The success of these collaborations supports the belief that organizational alignment is not a necessary condition for successful collaboration (Cowing and Moore, 1996). In the instance where cultural alignment was achieved, like in the case of Synaplex, the partners were able to effectively solve issues as they arose. The case studies reaffirmed that understanding cultural differences with ones partner is an important step in achieving cultural integration.

Jewish Factor

The Jewish factor was present in both collaborations. It had varying effects depending on the nature of the partnership. In both case studies, the Jewish factor expedited the creation of the collaboration. The case studies suggest that the partners' shared belief in *k'lal Yisrael*, or collective responsibility to Jewish peoplehood, was important in developing their partnership.

In Synaplex, the interviewees explained that *k'lal Yisrael* was the reason why their organizations collaborated. Jewish values played an important role in March of the Living and Café Europa. The Jewish Federation, JFS-LA and BJE-LA all collaborated because they wanted to educate teenagers about the Jewish belief of common good. While the Jewish factor was important in the development of each partnership, it was unclear from our study whether or not the Jewish factor effected the success of each collaboration.

Interaction of the Five Factors

The manor in which the five factors interacted could be compared to a wheel. In the center of the wheel is trust and surrounding trust are the other four factors. Trust needed to be present in order for partners to share resources, to overcome issues of proximity and for the belief in *k'lal Yisrael* to exist. The four factors on the outside of the wheel also interacted with one another. For example, in Synaplex the close geographical proximity between the two synagogues allowed for a high frequency of interactions, which helped them to establish a relationship that was conducive to cultural integration. In Café Europa and March of the Living, the geographical distance between the Los Angeles organizations and their Tel Aviv counterparts prevented the partnership from integrating the different organizational cultures. These two examples highlight the apparent interplay of the five factors. Due to the limited scope of our study, we were unable to closely evaluate their relationship and recommend that a further study be conducted examining the interaction of the five factors.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusions and Recommendations

Undertaking this study was an exciting and challenging process. We set out to prove two hypotheses: the first hypothesis stated that trust and control, knowledge and resource sharing, organizational proximity, organizational culture and the Jewish factor plays a central role in the development and implementation of inter-organizational collaborations, in the Jewish community. The second hypothesis stated that all of the above-mentioned variables would be present in two Jewish communal collaborations: Café Europa and March of the Living, and Synaplex. Through our study, we are able to conclude that both hypotheses are valid.

The literature review and case analyses reaffirmed the importance of the five elements identified in this study. Our case analyses showed that these elements serve as the basis for collaborating. The foundation for both collaborations was the establishment of trust. In both cases, inter-personal relationships were the basis for trust. The sustainability of trust depended upon whether the partners were able to transform inter-personal trust into inter-organizational trust. In addition to this transformation, it was also important that the partners developed clear lines of communication, established a clear delineation of roles and found a common ground. We recommend that Jewish organizations place effort in clarifying each of these aspects of trust when collaborating.

As identified in the literature review, both case analyses revealed that trust exists in a supplementary relationship with control. Confidence between partners is enhanced when

trust and control function in an accompanying relationship. In order to form this relationship, partners' must establish social and formal control. In both case studies, the partnering Jewish organizations relied heavily on social control, disregarding the development of formal control. There was an absence of formal contracts or other mechanisms to ensure transparency. We recommend a balance between both types of control, which will in effect increase control and henceforth the confidence between partners. Therefore, organizations should make a conscientious effort to build both social and formal control.

Inter-organizational trust is a necessary precondition for sharing resources and developing new knowledge. The four organizations we examined indicated that having previous interactions with their partners positively influenced their decision to share resources. The incorporation of a central funding organization helped build trust. By relying on a central funding organization, the partnering organizations willingly contributed other non-monetary resources.

In addition to trust, resource dependency played an important role in both case studies. The partners involved in both collaborations needed each other's resources in order to complete their respective program successfully. Resource dependency became an issue when resources were unevenly distributed among partners. With the establishment of a formal contract that clearly states each partner's capacity for sharing resources, future collaborations can avoid the issues related to resource dependency.

An inconsistency was presented when we examined the relationship between resource sharing and the development of new knowledge. In both case analyses, we were able to identify a successful sharing of resources, but the creation of new knowledge was present only in Synaplex. This discrepancy seems to suggest that the creation of new knowledge is not dependent on the successful sharing of resources. We are unable to conclude that this relationship exists and recommend it be examined in a future quantitative study.

In both of our studies, geographical proximity shaped the nature of the relationships between partners. When partnering organizations were geographically closer they enjoyed frequent interactions, which helped build a stronger collaboration. As a result, being close in proximity to one another allows partners to communicate regularly and establish common goals. In one of the cases where geographical distance was greater, the lack of frequent interactions and communication negatively affected the partnership. The same is the case with organizational proximity. The more partners interact, the higher the likelihood that they will understand each other's organizational demands. We recommend that organizations focus on developing mechanisms for communicating, in order to reduce the adverse effects of organizational proximity. By establishing regularly scheduled meetings, formulating an understanding of each other's organizational limitations and valuing honesty organizations will be able to better understand their counterparts.

Our study revealed that organizational culture played a significant role in the examined partnerships. It was important for partners' to understand each others' cultural type. The organizations that collaborated successfully were able to accept their partners' organizational

culture. Once a mutual respect was established, cultural alignment was achieved when organizations accepted their partners' cultural differences. The case analyses indicated that organizations with different cultural types can successfully achieve cultural alignment. Organizational culture should not be an obstacle for organizations that collaborate. We recommend that organizations identify, respect and embrace cultural differences.

The first four factors analyzed in this study are common to all collaborations. It was our goal to identify a fifth factor that would be specific to collaborations between Jewish organizations. The unique contribution of this study is the effect of the Jewish factor on collaboration. This study reveals that the Jewish factor accelerates the development of partnerships between Jewish organizations. This acceleration is based upon a series of shared Jewish principles. One of the key principles that was apparent in both case analyses was *k'lal Yisrael*; a shared destiny of Jewish peoplehood. Another principle includes Jewish continuity, which is a communal responsibility to ensure the future of the Jewish people. A commitment to a greater good was another Jewish principle that was evident in the shared vision behind the collaborations. It is important to remember that neither value alone or together is strong enough to create collaboration. We recommend that Jewish organizations use the Jewish factor as motivation for present and future collaborations.

Research remains to be done regarding effective methods of Jewish communal collaboration. In the process of completing this research, we came across a variety of collaborations that could be examined in future studies including the partnership between Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) and University of Southern California

(USC), HaMercaz, Combined Jewish Philanthropies (CJP) and its Synagogue partners in Boston, Massachusetts. The recent merger between the University of Judaism (UJ) and Brandeis-Bardin Institute (BBI) presents bright possibilities for future collaborations as well. Another possible topic would be a comparative study evaluating the five elements of collaboration between Jewish to Jewish organizational relations, Jewish to non-Jewish organizational relations and non-Jewish to non-Jewish organizational relations. The information provided within this study can act as a catalyst for future studies of collaboration in the Jewish community.

Appendixes

Appendix 1

Summary of Theories

<i>Elements</i>	<i>Theories</i>
Trust and control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust and its relationship with risk and uncertainty • Trust, good-faith and the effort to behave in accordance with any commitments • Trust and positive expectations that we have of our partners • Trust and Control help build confidence • Trust and Control coexist in a supplementary relationship • Control mechanisms: Goal setting, structural specification and cultural blending • Mechanism for creating and sustaining trust • Fragile vs. resilient trust • Conditional vs. unconditional trust • Companion trust, competence trust and commitment trust • The transition from inter-personal trust towards inter-organizational trust • Trust and its optimal level
Knowledge and Resource Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources scarcity theory • Formation and sustainability of collaborations • Conditions to transfer knowledge and move forward the strategic agenda (clear motivations, willingness to offer, desired areas of potential growth) • Symmetrical and knowledge transfer • Resource dependence theory • Resource deficiency theory and the creation of new knowledge • Internal preparations for an efficient sharing of knowledge • Community environment and the creation of new knowledge • The effect of bureaucracy in learning and transferring knowledge • Involvement and embeddedness two covariate means for knowledge creation • Inverse relationship between strategic effect and knowledge creation as reasons to collaborate • Absorptive capacity as a precondition for knowledge and resource sharing • Prior relationship between partners to secure a level of

	<p>absorptive capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect of trust in sharing knowledge and resources • London's stage theory to effectively share knowledge • Knowledge and resource sharing as a source of competitive advantage between partners
Proximity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition: being close to something measured on a specific dimension • Three levels of proximity: geographical, organizational and technological • Proximity is an important pre-condition for knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer and technology acquisition • The different dimension generally interacts and evolve over time
Organizational Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization culture as the foundation of every organization • Organizational culture as a mechanism for shaping group behavior and achieving best results • Schein's theory that organizational culture exist in layers • Hatch's 12 different types of organizational culture • Dynamics of cultural interaction and culture domination • Changes in organizational culture • Communication and the effect on organizational culture • Nahavandi and Malekzadeh's model to navigate cultural negotiations • Cultural compatibility and the development of collaborations
The Jewish Factor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jewish factor as a unique "flavor" for collaboration in the Jewish communal world • Partnership between Moses and Aaron. Identification of unique skills and characteristics and a common task • The building of the Mishkan (or Tabernacle) and the collaborative aspect of its process • Jewish Principles: Klal Yisrael (Jewish Peoplehood), Continuity and Commitment to a Greater Good • Jewish principles as a connector between Jewish Organizations

Appendix 2

Interview Questions

1. Please describe your collaborative model:
 - a. What were the motivations or reasons that your organization had while considering collaboration with other organizations?
 - b. Prior to engaging in the collaborative effort, what was your organizations attitude towards collaboration?
 - c. During the collaborative effort, what was your organizations attitude towards collaboration?
 - d. Did your organization conduct an internal assessment of available resources prior to committing to the collaboration?
 - e. What are the major outcomes from your collaborative model?
 - f. What were the defining elements that helped form your collaboration?
 - g. What was your organization looking for in this collaboration?
 - h. How difficult was the process of finding the right partner? Was it difficult to find a common ground with other organizations? What were the main characteristics that your organization was looking in a partner?
 - i. How did the collaboration affects your organizations mission and vision?
 - j. Do you forecast that this collaboration will continue to evolve, and in what manor?
 - k. What organizational structure were you able to develop in order to support your collaboration?
 - l. How was your organization's culture affected by the collaboration?

- m. Were there any measures taken to align your organization's culture with that of the other organizations involved in the collaboration?

2. Please describe your experience as a member of that collaborative model
 - a. Were your expectation fulfilled?
 - b. What were the shortcoming of your organization and those of your partner/s?
 - c. What elements of the process would you identify as main cause for shortcomings?
 - d. What elements of the process would you identify as critical for your success?

3. What role did proximity play in the development of your collaboration?

4. What role did trust and control play in the development of your collaboration?

5. What role did knowledge and resource sharing play in the development of your collaboration?

6. What are the implications of being in a collaboration with another Jewish organization?

7. Do you think that the Jewish factor plays any role in effecting the development of interorganizational collaboration?

8. What are the implications of being a Jewish communal organization while looking for partners outside the Jewish community?

9. We have mentioned several times the word "successful" how does your organization define success for a collaboration process?

10. Does your organization establish certain parameters before engaging in a collaboration model? What are your control variables that help you measure the outcomes of that collaboration?
11. How do you terminate collaboration? And what are the elements that contribute to termination?
12. Do you believe that in the LA Jewish community there are a large number of organizations duplicating efforts? If so what are the necessary steps to engage different organization to collaborate in order to reduce duplication and increase efficiency?

Appendix 3

Summary of Findings

<i>Elements</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Trust and control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both case analyses presented high level of trust base on previous relationships • Both case analyses presented lack of formal type of control • Both relied on social control • The Organizations presented strong commitment towards the collaborative that enhanced trust • The partners showed high positive expectation • Methods to build and maintain trust used in the collaborations: Risk sharing, creation of common ground, adaptation to the partners' needs and flexibility • Communication: the collaboration failed to use a formal communication system. March of the living and café Europa relied on informal and unplanned exchanges while Synaplex used the consultant as the main communication mechanism • Failed to build the bridge between inter-personal and inter-organizational trust
Knowledge and Resource Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both cases revealed a complete sharing of knowledge and resources, which led to knowledge creation in only one case • In the case of Synaplex, inter-personal tensions affected the use of the consultant; a fundamental resource for the collaboration • Proximity affected knowledge and resource sharing
Proximity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity played an important role in both collaborations • Lack of geographical proximity affected vision and creativity • Lack of geographical proximity generated logistic problems. • March of the living and Café Europa was affected due to proximity and the inability to communicate frequently with the Israeli partner. This generated problems with the understanding of the expectations of the Los Angeles and the Israeli partners • Organizational proximity enhanced the establishment of common ground. Familiarity between the organizations was crucial
Organizational Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In both case studies organizations made the necessary compromises in order to adapt and integrate with its partners • All the organizations showed flexibility • Compromises had limits, but flexible enough to accommodate every partners' needs
The Jewish Factor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jewish factor is a characteristic that gives a unique "flavor" to collaborations in the Jewish community

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles that are being used by the organizations: <i>K'lal Yisrael</i>, shared destiny, Jewish peoplehood and a commitment to a greater good • The Jewish communal aspect and the emotional aspect of Café Europa and Macrch of the living accelerated and strengthened the successful outcomes • The Jewish factor is represented in a set of already known assumptions that do not need to be discussed between Jewish partners. This could be positive or negative depending on the partners and the nature of the collaboration
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Bibliography

- Adobor, Henry (2006). Optimal trust? Uncertainty as a determinant and limit to trust in inter-firm alliances. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, vol. 27 No. 7 pp.537-553.
- Arino, A. (2003). Measures of strategic alliance performance: an analysis of construct validity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 34, pp. 66-79.
- Barringer, B.R., & Harrison, J.S. (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through inter-organizational relationships. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 367-403.
- Bensimon, S. (1999). Strategic alliances. *Executive Excellence*, Vol. 16 No. 10, p.9.
- Bijlsma-Frankema & K. Costa, A.C. (2005). Understanding the Trust and Control Nexus. *International Sociology*, 20(3): 259-282.
- Bleeke, J. & Ernst, D. (Eds.) (1993). Collaborating to Compete: Using Strategic Alliances and Acquisitions in the Global Marketplace, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Borsch, O. (1994). The process of relational contracting: developing trust-based strategic alliances among small business enterprises. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol. 10, pp.1205-30.
- Burmeister, A., & Colletis-Wahl, K. (1997). Proximity in production networks: the circulatory dimension. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 4(3): 231-241.
- www.Chabad.org *Chassidic Masters. Aaron: We have heard all about Moses; but who was Aaron.* Based on the teachings of the Lubavitcher Rebbe.
- www.Chabad.org *Chassidic Masters. On the Essence of Circumstance.* Based on the teachings of the Lubavitcher Rebbe.

- Chan, S.H., Kensinger, J.W., Keown, A.J. and Martin, J.D. (1997). Do Strategic alliances create value? *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 46, pp. 199-221.
- Child, J., & Faulkner, D. (1998). *Strategies of cooperation: Managing alliances, networks and joint ventures*. Oxford, England: oxford University Press.
- Contractor, F. & Lorange, P. (1998a). Why should firms co-operate? The strategic and economic basis for co-operative ventures”, in Contractor, F. and Lorange P. (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategies in International Business*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, pp. 3-28.
- Cooke, R.A. & Rousseau, D.M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group & Organization Management*, (13): 245-273.
- Cordero-Guzman, H.R. (2001). Inter-organizational Networks Among Community-Based Organizations. *Community Development Research Center. Robert J. Milano Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New York*.
- Cramton, C.D. (2001). The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. *Organization Science*, 12(3): 346-371
- Cumming L.L. & Bromley P. (1996) “The organizational trust inventory (OTI): development and validation. *Frontiers of Theory and Research* 302-30.
- Das, T.K. & Teng, B.S. (1998). Between Trust and Control: Developing Confidence in Partner Cooperation in Alliances. *The Academy of Management Review* (23)3: 491-512.
- Das, T.K. & Teng, B.S. (2001). Trust, Control and Risk in Strategic Alliances: An Integrated Framework. *Organization Studies* 22(2): 251-83.

- Dodgson, M. (1993). Learning, Trust and Technological Collaboration. *Human Relations* 46(1): 77-95.
- Doz, Y. (1996). The evolution of co-operative strategic alliances: initial conditions or learning processes? *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 55-83.
- Dyer, J.H. & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 660-679.
- Fisher, L.M. (1996). How strategic alliances work in biotech. *Strategy and Business, First Quarter*, 1-7.
- Gallaud, D., & Torre, A. (2004). Geographical proximity and circulation of knowledge through inter-firm cooperation. In Wink, R. (ed.), *Academia Business Link: European Policy Strategies and Lessons Learnt*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 137-158.
- Gallaud, D., & Torre, A. (2005). Geographical proximity and the diffusion of knowledge: the case of SME's in biotechnology. In Koch, A. (ed.), *Rethinking Regional Innovation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 127-146.
- Gertler, M.S. (1995). Being there -- proximity, organization and culture in the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies. *Economic Geography*, 71(1): 1-26.
- Grandori, A. & Soda, G. (1995). Inter-firm networks: Antecedents, mechanism and forms. *Organization Studies* (16): 183-214.

- Gulati, R. (1995a). Does Familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choices in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 85-112.
- Gulati, R. (1998). Alliances and networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 19, pp. 293-317.
- Gulati, R., Nohhria, N. & Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic Networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 203-15.
- Hagedoorn, J., & Schakenraad, J. (1994). The effect of strategic technology alliances on company performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 15(4): 291-309.
- Hallen, L., Johanson, J., & Seyed-Mohamed, N. (1991). Inter-firm adaptation in business relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(2): 29-37.
- Hamel, G. Doz, Y.L., & Prahalad, C.K. (1989). Collaborate with your competitors and win. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1), 133-139.
- Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. (2003). Resources, knowledge and influence: The organizational effects of interorganizational collaboration: Forms and facades of trust. In C. Lane & R. Bachmann (Eds.), *Trust within and between organizations* (pp. 64-87). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hatch, M.J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(4): 657-693.
- Inkpen, A.C. & Beamish, P.W. (1997). Knowledge, bargaining power and the instability of international joint ventures. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 177-202.
- Jones, G. & George, J. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 531-46.

- Kale, P., Singh, H. & Perlmutter, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: building relational capital. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 217-37.
- Kanter, R.M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4): 96-108.
- Kirat, T. & Lung, Y. (1999). Innovation and proximity – Territories as loci of collective learning processes. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 6(1): 27-38.
- Knoben, J., & Oerlemans, L.A.G. (2006). Proximity and inter-organizational collaboration: A literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 8(2): 71-89.
- Kumar, R., & Nti, K.O. (1998). Differential learning and interaction in alliance dynamics: A process and outcome discrepancy model. *Organization Science*, 9, 356-367.
- Martin, J. & Siehl, C. (1983) Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12 (Autumn), 52-64.
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. & Kramer, R.M. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In R.M. Kramer and T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations: Frontier of theory and research*. New York: Sage.
- Lane, P.J., & Lubatkin, M. (1998). Relative absorptive capacity and inter-organizational learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 461-477.
- Larson, R., Bengtsson, L., Henriksson, K., & Sparks, J. (1998). The inter-organizational learning dilemma: Collective knowledge development in strategic alliances. *Organizational Science*, 9(3), 285-305.

- London, T., Rondinelli, D. A., & O'Neill, H. M. 2004. Exploring uneasy learning alliances between corporations and non-profit organizations. In D. H. Nagao (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixty-third Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management* (CD).
- Nahavandi, A., & Malekzadeh, A. (1988). Acculturation in mergers and acquisitions. *Academy of Management Review, 13(1)*, 79-90.
- Newell S., & Swan J. (2000). Trust and inter-organizational networking. *Human Relations, 53(10)*: 1287-1328.
- Oerlemans, L.A.G., & Meeus, M.T.H. (2005). Do Organizational and spatial proximity impact on firm performance? *Regional Studies, 39(1)*: 89-104.
- Ouchi, W.G. & Wilkins, A.L. (1985). Organizational culture. *Annual Review of Sociology, 11*, 457-483.
- Parker, B. & Selsky, J.W. (2004). Interface dynamics in cause-based partnerships: An exploration of emergent culture. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33(3)*, 458-488.
- Powell, W.W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 295-336.
- Powell, W.W., Koput, K.W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Inter-organizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 116-145.
- Ring, P.S. & Van de Ven, A.H. (1994). Development processes of co-operatives, inter-organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review (19)*: 90-118.
- Sako, M. (1992). Prices, quality and trust: How Japanese and British companies manage buyer-supplier relations. *Cambridge University Press*.

- Shapiro, D., Sheppard, B. & Cherskin, L. (1992). Business on a handshake. *Negotiation Journal* (8): 365-77.
- Schein, E.H. (1991). What is culture? In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture*: 243-253. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Scott, J. (1987). *Organizations*. Engelwoods Cliffs, NJ: Simon and Schuster.
- Simonin, B.L. (1997). The importance of collaborative know-how: An empirical test of the learning organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1150-1174.
- Swartz, M., & Jordon, D. (1980). *Culture: An anthropological perspective*. New York: John Wiley.
- Todeva, E., & Knoke, D., (2005). Strategic alliances and models of collaboration. *Management Decision*. Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 123-148.
- Torre, A., & Rallet, A. (2005). Proximity and localization. *Regional Studies*, 39(1): 47-59.
- Tremblay, D., Klein, J., Fontan, J., & Roussaeau, S. (2003). Territorial proximity and Innovation: a survey in the Montreal Region. *Revue d'Economie Regionale et Urbaine*, (5): 835-852.
- Tushman, M.L. & Anderson, P. (1986). Technological discontinuities and organizational environment. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 31(3): 439-465.
- Utaal, B. (1983, October 17). The corporate culture vultures. *Fortune*.
- Zeller, C. (2004) North Atlantic innovative relations of Swiss pharmaceuticals and the proximities with regional biotech areas. *Economic Geography*, 80(1): 83-111.
- Zucker, L.G. (1986). Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840-1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior* (8): 53-111

The Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles: www.JewishLA.org

Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles: www.JFSLA.org

Bureau of Jewish Education of Los Angeles: www.BJELA.org

Temple Aliyah: www.templealiyah.org

Temple Judea: www.templejudea.com

Synagogues: Transformation and Renewal: www.starsynagogue.org