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Abstract

The aim of the thesis is to analyze local Corporate Social Responsibility and how this relates to local political priorities in Denver, Colorado to provide insights both in the US context but also in the midst of the Swedish debate regarding the role of private provision of welfare. The research questions are threefold: 1. Are private engagements addressing welfare issues as identified by the public sector?, 2. What is the interaction between public and private sector in social engagements in Denver? and 3. What expressions of a governance network prevails in the cross-sector interactions in social provisions in this case study? The empirical material used in this case study consist of data collected by conducting semi-structured interviews from Denver-based corporations and individuals working for the City and County of Denver. Theories of governance; network governance and interactive governance have been applied in structuring and in the analysis of the empirical data. The results indicate that due to the internal incapacity as a result of the fiscal- and spending restrictions of the public sector in the provision of social services, the public sector lacks the capacity in providing social services for the constituents. This has opened up for a need of nontraditional governance solutions which includes a dependence of private-sector provision of welfare. Furthermore, there are expressions which indicate that CSR does play a role in the local provision of social services by filling the gap of provision which is left as a result of the institutional incapacity of the public sector. However, there are indicators of large variations in the connectedness of the linkages within the network, varying from close connections and comanagement between CSR and public initiatives to activities expressed as the self-governance of corporations in the provision of social services, making top-down goal sharing such as incentives crucial for the public sector to get corporations to address local priorities. Keywords: governance, interactive governance, network governance, welfare provision, cross-sector, CSR
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Introduction

In the last few decades, corporations and businesses have started to engage in activities which traditionally used to be classified as public sector and governmental activities (Scherer and Palazzo, 2011:900). Scherer & Palazzo argues that corporations - especially multinational corporations - are engaging in self-regulated social engagements to fill the global governance gaps which are created in a globalized world where the traditional governments are no longer able to solely govern societies themselves. This is a trend which is confirmed by the fact that since the beginning of this millennium, over 13500 corporate participants have joined a global self-regulated initiative, the UN Global Compact which is an initiative created to collectively engage corporations to voluntarily work towards ten principles in e.g. social, labor and environmental issues (UN Global Compact 2019). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has progressively grown over time and is today playing an important role within the private sector in philanthropic work, PR and community investments. Simultaneously, government agencies on all levels are responsible for assuring that businesses are conducting business according to current laws and regulations set up by the public sector. While public sector can regulate laws in which businesses operate, the public sector can also choose to collaborate with businesses through cross sector partnerships to help expedite government funded social programs. The growing activities of businesses in traditionally viewed public sector areas are an indicator that the private and public sector are becoming more linked. Scherer and Palazzo (2012, 17) argues that the traditional - economic - view of the division of the public and the private, where the private sector is seen as being mainly responsible for the political and businesses and corporations are viewed as solely economic actors, does no longer hold. While globalization has created a number of governance gaps in legislating corporate activities at the international arena, corporations acting within the national level are conducting business within the regulations of national laws in which it operates. This makes government and local governments an important role for businesses. Previous research has shown a change in government during the last few decades where there has been as a shift from government to governance which refers to the new way that society is governed by bringing in non-government actors across all levels in providing social services for the constituents. In this governance shift, private actors are assuming an increasingly vital role in engaging in societal issues through various collaborations with government agencies. Looking at traditionally government held issues such as welfare provision and social programs, what is the role of CSR
and are there signs of cross sector synergies between new governance solutions by public sector and corporations?

Corporate Social Responsibility is originally an economic term but is also studied within the fields of political science and international relations. Some researchers argue that international and nation state institutions are not able to solve the issues of the governance gap. Instead, they argue that political scientists need to acknowledge the role which NGOs and corporations hold in the arena of governance in bridging the governance gap (Scherer and Palazzo, 2012, Ruggie, 2004). Much research has been done in the global perspective of CSR in relation to the governance gap, which refers to no governmental institutions being able to regulate the development of corporations, but there is a clear research gap on the relation between public and private sector governance on a local level. Some studies show a relationship between corporations that engage in CSR to a higher degree also avoid more taxes, suggesting that the relationship between CSR and taxes are substitutes of one another. This further implicates the relationship between corporations’ tax payment and tax funded welfare systems (Davis et al 2016:29), especially considering the complete lack of official institutions which would follow up and evaluate CSR engagements. From this, there is a need to study the public private relationship in social issues - between CSR and the nation state welfare systems in states where state encouragements are given to corporations engaging in. Thus, are corporations operating in areas which are benefiting the welfare system and how is the private sector working in collaboration with the public sector in identified areas? These are issues that are particularly interesting to study in the context of Denver as the city of Denver is the biggest city in the state of Colorado, a state which is unique in the US as it has the most restrictive tax and spending cap for the public sector in the United States. Under this tax and spending cap, governments working in providing social services may face additional challenges in welfare provisions..
Aim of the Study
This thesis is a study of the interaction between corporations and local government in social areas. As corporations are increasingly facing a demand by society to undertake greater responsibilities which goes beyond the traditional economic responsibilities of private corporations, the public sector is simultaneously facing challenges in the governing of society which has led to the inclusion of private actors in previously viewed government responsibilities. This study is a case study of the governance needs and capacities of social issues in Denver - mainly between corporations and government actors using an interactive governance theory.

Based on previous literature within the fields of CSR and welfare provision, this thesis will contribute to more knowledge in cross-sector interactions in complex welfare issues on a local level using theories of governance - interactional governance theory and network governance theory. The aim of the thesis is to analyze local CSR and how this relates to local political priorities. This will provide insights both in the US research but also in the midst of a new Swedish debate regarding the role of private governance and welfare systems. Furthermore, this thesis will give more insight into how corporations motivate their social engagements on a local level in the city of Denver.

Research Questions
The aim of the thesis will be answered using the following research questions in guiding the analysis of local CSR:
RQ 1: Are private engagements addressing welfare issues as identified by the public sector?
RQ 2: What is the interaction between public and private sector in social engagements in Denver?
RQ 3: What expressions of a governance network prevails in the cross-sector interactions in social provisions in this case study?

Limitations
The research process has faced a number of restrictions, mainly due to time limitations and limitations in length of the paper which has narrowed the scope of the study in writing a master’s thesis. This thesis has only analyzed two different type of actors in the provision of social services; the City and County of Denver and local corporations. In practice, there are a number of other central actors in the provision of welfare, including NGOS and other private...
actors. As such, some relevant aspects in the provision of welfare in Denver are not included in the study. Furthermore, the corporations that are represented in this study were chosen on behalf of one main requirement – the existing local CSR engagements of the company. Therefore, the study did not necessarily include specific corporations that are already officially involved in cross-sector collaborations in the provision of welfare but rather focused on local CSR activities and their experiences and views of the role of corporations in welfare provision.

Disposition
The next chapter of the thesis will provide insights in the existing literature on CSR amongst multiple disciplinary fields and regarding research on the welfare state. The literature review is followed by a presentation of the theoretical frameworks utilized in this study: Governance theory, Network governance theory and the Interactive governance framework as well as an operationalization of the theories. The following chapter presents the research design, method and the empirical data which was collected for the purpose of this thesis. The second half of the thesis consists of the analysis which is followed by a concluding discussion where the research questions are stated and answered. Lastly, some final remarks and suggestions for future research are presented.

Previous Research
This chapter will provide an insight into various fields of research in the areas of CSR and government based social provision in the United States. The literature review consists of a brief overview of general research concerning the concept within business and economic research which helps to explain the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. This is followed by summarizing the main research of CSR within the disciplinary research field of political science which has served the purpose of locating research gaps which has assisted in formulating the research aim for this thesis. Furthermore, this chapter will retail essential literature in welfare systems, specifically around the US welfare state as it is central to have fundamental knowledge in the provision of welfare in the United States for the purpose of this study. Finally, this chapter will end by briefly retailing the Swedish welfare state to help contextualize the social provisions in the United States for Swedish readers.
The relationship between corporations and social issues may not be a clear one but has existed for thousands of years - mainly perhaps as a negative relationship between corporations, human right violations, labor issues and environmental degradations. In the age of globalization, the public-private governance relationship has grown to be more interesting within the research fields of political science and international relations. Today, multinational corporations collectively make up almost a third of the world’s economic entities and some researchers argue that large corporations on the international arena have gained access to power and influence which only nation states used to possess (Heasman 2018:12). Furthermore, globalization has connected the world in various ways and has resulted in most national state borders do not limit multinational corporations in the same manner they did centuries ago. These days, companies can pick and choose to operate in different areas of the world - places which can have a huge variation in the status regarding legal, societal, economic, environmental and democratic variables. Detomasi (2008) argues that this is a sort of governance gap, with no nation state or international institutions being able to regulate the actions and development of corporations. Instead, media, non-governmental organizations, and consumers are functioning as scrutinizing entities, reporting and reacting on companies in relation to societal issues.

As previously mentioned, CSR is originally an economic term and is therefore mainly mentioned within economic and business research. Within these fields of study, CSR is mainly scrutinized on the business side of perspective regarding the inter business view and consequences from CSR for the firm and the stakeholders in question. Here, economists often argue for the maximization of shareholder value, thus arguing for leaving the social issues to the public sector (Sherer and Palazzo 2011). In the dissertation ‘Searching for the Social: Corporate Social Responsibility and the Economic Regulation Beyond the State’, Sabadoz (2015) does not only give an extensive background of the main research areas within political CSR, but also give a number of implications for future studies based on the current situation of the CSR literature. Furthermore, Sabadoz states that there is a big research gap within the CSR literature regarding the demand side of CSR engagements. Much research has been done on multinational corporations and CSR engagements in the multinational aspect, mainly studying

---

1 A corporation is a large company or group of companies that are controlled as a single organization and legally exist as a single entity separate from persons who run it
the factors to why corporations choose to engage in societal issues. However, the aspect of society’s demands from CSR engagements remains to be unexplored (Sabadoz 2015). Based on this, there is a need to study corporate engagement and how they correspond to identified social needs. How do corporations choose to address a particular societal issue? Furthermore, do they consult with the public sector in identifying needs in society?

During the last decade, researchers are increasingly starting to scrutinize the concept of CSR and CSR engagements in the political arena (see Scherer and Palazzo 2011) where corporations are assuming more and more responsibilities in society. The majority of these studies all observe the phenomenon of firms - again, mainly multinational corporations (MNC) - as acquiring new roles. This raises the question of the role of the firm in society. As previously indicated, many studies on political CSR (Scherer and Palazzo 2006, Scherer and Palazzo 2007) are studying CSR within a global governance perspective. The public and private sectors’ role and relationship, mainly between CSR and state agencies, specifically on a local level, remains largely unexplored. In ‘Corporate Social Responsibility and the Welfare State: The Historical and Contemporary Role of CSR in the Mixed Economy of Welfare’, Brejning (2012) writes about corporate social responsibility in Europe and how it is becoming a concept of increasing importance both on a national and an international level. CSR takes on a range of social issues and is also a tool used by government agencies to address social issues, making it a concept of relevance both in the business world but also in the political and civic spheres. Furthermore, Brejning also argues that considering the historical disciplinary focus of CSR has been from the business- and economic research fields, this has resulted in a significant research gap on the impact and relationship between CSR and society. CSR activities can take on a number of forms and is often times an expression of businesses and employers providing welfare for either employees or part of communities in which corporations are operating in. Brejning (2012:16) furthermore states that the expressions of welfare provision initiatives from non-state actors make CSR a concept that is interesting to study in regard to the significance it has on society in a welfare state, mainly in a qualitative research method and that there is a need for more research around the yet to be explored connections between CSR and the welfare state. The large focus of the state responsibility in social welfare throughout the last decades which some say caused the ‘welfare state crisis’ of the 70s and 80s, where the private services in the provision of welfare suddenly became a topic of political relevance (Brejning 2012:2).
There is a consensus within the political CSR literature which states that CSR differs between CSR on a global level and CSR at the national level (Ruggie, 2017). There is a view of the national level CSR as corporations are operating in functional political frameworks where the government is the strong legislative authority whereas CSR on a global level is characterized by frameworks and rules as unable to regulate the actions of multinational corporations (Scherer and Palazzo 2008). Thus, the “governance gap” has resulted in some critics arguing that global MNC-CSR engagements simply create an opportunity for corporations to continue avoiding national and global regulations by performing inadequate responses to global issues. Endeavors to form an international governance arena which would regulate multinational corporations have been made since the 1970s (Ruggie 2017:2) and exist today via “soft law” UN regulations, but CSR engagements continues to be voluntary.

Regarding CSR in the US, the federal Bureau of Economic and Business affairs currently leads a team on CSR with the focus on promoting responsible business practices while maintaining economic security of the state. The federal CSR team encourages US companies and stakeholders to engage in CSR activities in a number of areas such as good corporate citizenship, human rights, anti-corruption, health and social welfare and environmental protection among other fields (Camilleri 2017:83). In the US, the institutional norms as advocated by a range of US institutions such as bureaus, agencies and stakeholders are, according to Camilleri pushing a social responsibility agenda on US businesses through policies to advance US companies towards increasing their investments in social and environmental innovation (Kanter 1998, Camilleri 2017). However, corporate social responsibility is still mainly regarded as voluntary social or environmental engagements as there are yet no specific laws which require businesses to tackle additional social action which goes beyond their day to day business practices. Although, sound practices may also be associated with a higher level of economic performance of the business and could therefore be seen as a strategic way of business in a time where concepts such as political consumerism and responsible consumerism are highly relevant. Consequently, there are studies that towards the expectations and desires which stem from civil society towards corporations and businesses are the reasons to why corporations are engaged in CSR. Carroll’s pyramid of CSR (1979) is a significant contribution to research on CSR as it singles out definitional aspects of CSR. In 2016, Carroll revisited the pyramid for the second time with a few contributions. Carroll argues that the first foundation of CSR is built upon an economically functioning business which is a socioeconomic aspect desired by the community in which the company operates in. The second
level of the pyramid is the society’s expectations on businesses to obey the laws of which it operates. The third level of the pyramid is the ethical responsibilities of the business where businesses are expected to actively avoid participating in harmful activities with society and other stakeholders. Finally, the fourth step of the pyramid is the CSR and the philanthropic level which is expressed as not expected, but desired by society and that the fourth level includes giving back to the community of which the company is a part of (Carroll 2016:5).

In sum, the CSR research literature is vast, partly because of CSR being an interdisciplinary field of study and would therefore be difficult to summarize in a literature review. However, much of the existing research on CSR can be found mainly in economic, business and management studies but also in development studies within the field of international relations. Furthermore, ‘The Oxford handbook on CSR’ is a good source of an overview of the current state in CSR research. The handbook exists as a collection of papers on CSR which are both written and edited by prominent CSR researchers. The handbook does not deal with CSR as a concept but as a field of study, identifying the current state of research in the field (Crane; ed., 2008). As previously stated, CSR has also been studied within the field of political science, mainly in relation to globalization and governance (Scherer and Palazzo 2011). As many other broadly used concepts, CSR or Corporate Social Responsibility, has multiple definitions. Carroll (2015) define CSR as applying ethical, legal philanthropic and economic responsibilities to a business strategy. The European Commission (2017) has a slightly
different definition, calling it the responsibility which corporations and enterprises take regarding what the impact their business strategies have on society. In this study, Carroll’s definition will be applied when referring to CSR, as a concept of ethical, philanthropic and economic responsibilities of businesses. The research gaps identified here regarding CSR consist of more research needed on CSR from a political perspective and in relation to governance. Moreover, most political studies of CSR are conducted in a global setting which entails different legal frameworks from CSR engagements on the national level. Hence, the relationship between governmental institutions and CSR and CSR on the local level needs to be studied further and to explore the public private relationship regarding CSR engagement.

**Welfare Systems – the United States and Sweden**

According to Oxford Dictionaries, a welfare state is defined as:

“A system whereby the government undertakes to protect the health and well-being of its citizens, especially those in financial or social need, by means of grants, pensions, and other benefits.” - Oxford Dictionaries, 2019

As the aim of this thesis is to explore how CSR relates to local government priorities in social issues, it is relevant to look at the government and welfare provisions. This chapter will give an overview of what a welfare state is, followed by a number of key distinctions of the US welfare state and will end by briefly compare it to the Swedish welfare state to help contextualize the concepts used in this thesis.

**Two Welfare Systems**

Esping-Andersen (1998:18) raises the question of defining welfare states and furthermore how we can identify a welfare state which responds to the needs of its citizen and how and why welfare states differ among each other. Esping-Andersen critically refers to the broad and general dictionary definition of a welfare state as posed above and furthermore argues that such a broad definition in fact circles around the issue of defining a welfare state. A broad description says nothing about the welfare system improving system legitimacy and which engagements welfare system in fact undertakes in protecting the health and well-being of its citizens (Esping-Andersen 1998:18). Furthermore, Esping-Andersen (1998:20) argues that most studies aiming to study welfare states focus on the fiscal spending which may be misleading as some nation states spend large sums on welfare policies that are aimed to
improve tax privileges and insurance plans which mainly benefit the middle-class citizens and is therefore not adequate in explaining welfare systems and variations as such.

Another common conceptualization of the ‘welfare state’ is understood as a state where the government is providing minimum standards of living, such as safety, income, education and housing to each of its’ citizens which is viewed as a social right of the people living in those states (Wilensky and Lebaux 1965:xii) which is often advocated by both leaders and citizen in many parts of the world but is expensive in practice which opens up for heated discussions regarding taxes and the role of the government in the economy (Wilensky 2012). The United States, sometimes regarded as a ‘reluctant welfare state’, has a number of areas which are unique in relation to other welfare states, some which are exceptional to the United States and some aspects are shared with other welfare states which undeniably makes the US a special case in regard to its’ welfare system as described by Wilensky (2012). Here, a few will be touched upon to gather a view of ways which the US welfare system differs from others. One aspect is the national health insurance since the US is an extreme outlier in regard to be the only rich democracy without a general national health insurance system. Instead, health care in the US is either individually financed, bargained or provided by an employer or the private sector. Another aspect is the deterioration of private pensions where the majority of the private sector employers have shifted from providing pension benefits to the defined contribution which are expensive, almost twice as expensive, saving accounts for retirement (Almeida and Boivie, 2009). A third aspect, although not unique to the US, is the passive approach to labor market policies which offers little government supported rehabilitation, assistance or unemployment insurance to its’ citizens. The fourth aspect, where the US is a bottom scoring case is the policies to social problems which are caused by structural change, such as changes in demographics, occupational shifts e.g., with little to none investments in family policies such as child care centers, preschool education and maternity/parental leave and flexible retirement.

In “The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism” Esping-Andersen describes welfare state variations which are clustered by various types of regimes. In the “Liberal Welfare State”, with the United States as one example, welfare benefits are designed to mainly serve low-income or working-class citizens. The progress of welfare reforms has been restricted by liberal norms, such as work ethics which has resulted in stigma in receiving welfare instead of working. In these occasions, the state welfare benefits are often unpretentious. In this cluster of welfare systems, the nation state furthermore often encourages the private sector either passively or
actively to offer alternatives to state welfare benefits. These encouragements result in the government contributing in making welfare a commodity by having a market-differentiated welfare on one hand and a state-welfare on the other hand which differs in both benefits and in overall quality (Esping-Andersen 1998:26). In the US, the public sector is thus not always the responsible actor in providing social services as there is a strong tradition of private provision of welfare. Furthermore, US welfare systems can furthermore vary largely depending on different state policies. One example in the private sector engagements in social issues is expressed by US corporations receiving tax reliefs from the public sector on charitable donations. Corporations are therefore both seen as encouraged to provide in social issues and the public sector also relies on them doing so. It is estimated that in 2017, US corporations gave a total of $20.77 billion to charitable causes in the United States (Givingusa.org, 2019)

**Sweden - Moving Towards a Neoliberal Welfare State**

As a reference, another welfare system cluster which Esping-Andersen accounts for is the “social democratic state” where Sweden is included within the cluster. In the social democratic cluster of welfare systems, social democracy was a driving force behind welfare reforms which has resulted in a welfare state with the tradition of not encouraging a two-folded welfare system shared between the market and the state but instead to encourage a welfare state which strives to advance high equality and not only serving the citizens in providing minimal needs as promoted in other clusters of welfare systems. The social democratic welfare state is designed to isolate the private sector from the state-carried welfare which aims to create solidarity among citizens towards the welfare state (Esping-Andersen 1998: 27-28). Hence, the traditional view of Sweden under the social democratic state includes a view of the public sector as being the main actor in providing services in social issues and where the private sector is expected to stay in the economic sector, having the main responsibility in providing jobs and economic growth. This divide has traditionally not been as clear in the United States, as argued by Esping-Andersen.

However, in the last few decades, the Swedish welfare system has gone through a shift towards a new direction of welfare services - towards neoliberal solutions of welfare benefits similar to what is implemented in the United States which largely depends on the belief that economic practices and liberated entrepreneurial freedoms are key factors in ensuring the well-being of society (Harvey 2005:2). Despite maintaining a universal welfare provision, there has been a significant rise of private solutions and market-oriented provisions of welfare in multiple social
policy areas. The market-oriented policies in the provision of welfare is characterized by performance measures, decentralization, applying private managerial practices, outsourcing and utilizing privatization to address social needs (Wiborg 2013:407).

The Swedish private sector is thriving in the provision of social services and the public sector is annually investing about SEK 30 billion in outsourcing contracts towards private social provisions. This new direction of welfare provision has continuously been evolved through New Public Management in the public sector which comes from economic and neoliberal ideas which include governing techniques such as market solutions and private contracting and has expeditiously increased nationwide while the level of privatization still varies among regions (Burström 2015). As such, while Sweden still may be considered a universal welfare state, there has been a shift from being a traditional social democratic welfare state towards being more dependent on private provision of welfare and is continuously moving towards the liberal welfare state model of welfare states. It is therefore relevant to study Denver which is an extreme case of employing liberal market solutions due to unique tax restrains and to reference it to Sweden which is moving towards similar, perhaps not as extreme, market solutions in social services. Some researchers furthermore argue that when states that offer a universal provision of welfare start approaching neoliberal market-oriented provision of welfare, this opens up for questions regarding the legitimacy of the welfare state (Klintgaard 2007:178). The increase in market-oriented provision of welfare in the context of a universal welfare state could also open up for issues of legitimacy regarding the prevalence of the public, standardized welfare provision on one hand and individualized market provisions on the other hand where citizen who pay for the individual market-provision may not see the reason in paying taxes in the long run (Andersen 2003a:69) and in making welfare a commodity.

**Summary of Previous Literature**

To summarize the literature review of previous CSR research, there have been many studies conducted in economic- and business fields of research. Within the fields of political science and international relations, much CSR research has been on the aspect of CSR and various government agencies in a global perspective, mainly looking at the CSR of multinational corporations (MNC) and international intergovernmental organizations which is where the concept of a governance gap has arisen. The literature review also reveals a research gap on the receiving end of CSR or on CSR and its relation to welfare initiatives. Research within the disciplinary field of political science would thus excel within CSR research and its interaction
and connection with civil society and the public sector. Thus, the connection of the welfare state and CSR on a local level is one identified research gap identified in this literature review. The literature review has furthermore provided insights in the US welfare state which is essential in scrutinizing the social provisions within the US context. Previous literature in the welfare state indicates that the US welfare state to a large degree depends on the market-differentiated provision of welfare with a public sector which is largely dependent on private actors. As such, it is relevant to look at the connection and interaction between local CSR and welfare provisions.

**Theoretical Framework**

While CSR scholars are arguing that the global governance gap and CSR is interesting to study due to the lack of global regulations and monitoring of corporations, a study on CSR on the local level from a similar point of view is interesting to study as well as there is a research gap on the relation between CSR and society on a local level. This also considering that local governance is set up by other mechanisms than on the global level but is not necessarily bound to the same governance gap as on a global level. The question then would not be how corporations operate in a lack of national regulations as on a global scale, but more so on how the relationship between the public and private sector looks in CSR engagements and the governance and accountability looks like regarding social engagements. This thesis will use the application of governance theories in assessing the empirical issue of local CSR and social priorities as governance theory is a central theory in explaining crosssector interactions. As this thesis aims to explore specific aspects of the empirical problem, multiple aspects of governance theory will be applied. Applications of governance concepts will be utilized to help understand the public-private interactions in this empirical case while the analysis will be structured with the help of the conceptual tools of the interactional governance framework. The combination of theories in this thesis are as such closely linked where the general theoretical assumptions of governance and network governance function as the underlying basis in understanding governing and cross-sector interactions. Interactional governance is developed by Kooiman, a leading scholar within governance network theory (Davies 2011:13). Interactive governance is a more practical tool which is closely connected to governance network theory and is utilized to structure the analysis of cross-sector interactions in this thesis and builds upon the concepts of governance which aligns with the purpose of the thesis in exploring the relationship between the public and private sector in local CSR engagements.
Governance

Globalization has resulted in new solutions in governing societies and nation states as the changing economic, political, and cultural landscapes have changed drastically in the last 30 years (Ritzer 2011). To maintain governance in a new - complex - globalized setting, new means of governance systems have been established in some parts of societies around the world which oftentimes includes nontraditional, hierarchical structures. In some new governance systems, deregulations of traditional welfare areas have been implemented to include private sector to a larger degree. There has been much research on governance within the field of political science during the last decades. Research on governance has gradually turned into its own subfield, slightly varying between different locations. This has resulted in the term “governance” being a wide concept with numerous definitions.

A Shift from Government to Governance
Some researchers refer to governance as the business of government - thus keeping governance closely linked to government and the public sector (Pierre & Peters 2005:2) while some researchers argue that governments no longer have the capacity of solely governing societies, further arguing that governance today refers to networks systems functioning within a governance framework (Rhodes 1997). Pierre & Peters (2005) argue that the public sector is not the sole institution participating in governance as the traditional view may suggest, but instead participates - and is an essential part - in a democratic governance (Pierre & Peters 2005:3). Perhaps the most prominent concept within governance literature is multi-level governance (MLG) which includes a range of governance solutions such as network modes of governance and governance throughout different levels of power and traditional hierarchical levels. The significance of MLG as both a theory and empirical tool within political science is its capability to classify and fathom various political systems and solutions (Bache and Flinders 2004, Piattoni 2010). Both definitions of MLG by Marks (1993:392) and Bache and Flinders (2004:3) states that MLG includes at least two of the following dimensions; a vertical dimension, a horizontal dimension and a transnational dimension of governance. The vertical dimension implicates the different levels of governance within a multi-level governance system. This implies involving e.g. federal levels, state levels and municipal levels in governance modes. The horizontal dimension implicates the different sectors engagements in governance, where both private and public actors are included in, often times, networks of governance and calls attention to the override from public monopoly of governance to a new
system of governance where businesses and organizations play an increasingly vital role. This is often referred to as a shift from government to governance (Peters and Pierre 2001). Some researchers argue that in the shadow of different levels of governance, some major issues have arisen, such as issues of legitimacy and accountability (Peters and Pierre 2004). Therefore, scrutinizing the relation of private and public sector in corporate engagements in welfare issues is of interest. The US federal and state level incitements to appeal to the private sector’s social engagements through e.g. various tax reliefs could be viewed a type of governance system in societal and welfare issues based on the vertical and horizontal dimensional aspects of governance and opens up on questions of accountability and legitimacy of private sector engagements in social issues. This is especially the case if the private sector takes no consideration of existing societal issues and priorities of society. Governance theory is a key theory to explore the consociation of private and private sector relations in local issues as governance theory problematizes various sectors of society and their roles in working to solve societal issues (Fell 2008:8).

Pierre and Peters (2005:3) argue for the governance approach where the state is viewed as whilst being less strong than previously still remains a central actor within governance as the state agencies are still in control of critical resources. Furthermore, they argue that the most efficient governance forms are those who include both a strong state on one hand but also social networks in order to govern complex societies and policy areas. Accordingly, these network modes of governance, where a network of discretionary action are the basis of political steering can work efficiently as long as all actors within a network have the same visions. Nevertheless, a network governance mode with actors in conflict can be detrimental. Here, Pierre and Peters (2005:3) argue that only governments have the capacity to remedy disagreements between network actors and to allocate proper resources. In sum, to comprehend governance as a concept comes down to an apprehension of state-society interactions in public interest issues which includes studying potential conflicts and synergies in bringing different actors together in a network governance. In this thesis, governance is used as an analytical point of entry in assessing cross sector interactions and the significance of governance interactions.

Network Governance
As previously stated, there are currently a range of varieties within governance theory. One form of governance is the network governance which refers to when different actors consociate in spontaneously created networks as a result of state initiatives and is often times viewed as
an efficient and legitimate way of solving societal issues by consociating different actors on a local level which accords to representative democracy values (Pierre and Peters 2000; Fell 2008:7). Accordingly, network modes of governance utilize local knowledge and resources from local actors which oftentimes results in more efficient and cost-effective solutions to local issues. Sørensen and Torfing (2005:197) have a definition of what attributes network constellations of governance should have in order to fall under the concept of network governance. As such, a governance network could be defined as a comparatively stable horizontal gathering made up by interdependent, but somewhat functionally autonomous actors who interact through various negotiations and materializes within an institutionalized body of norms and rules. Furthermore, the gathering is self-regulated and works for a public purpose operating within rules as set by external actors (Sørensen and Torfing 2005:197). The governance networks could take on a range of different configurations; they can be formally or informally organized, the degree to which the different actors within a governance networks are engaged in each other’s engagements can vary largely, and the governance networks can be fairly short lived, or it can exist for a long period of time. In this thesis, the public/private relation in welfare issues in Denver will be explored using governance, specifically network governance theory, to help understand the cross-sector interplay regarding CSR.

Despite recognizing the significance of networks mechanisms in governance, Pierre and Peters (2005:68) argue that governance networks do not hold the capacity to govern societies on their own. Instead, the authors argue that the role of the state still holds a central role in significant tasks within network governance of societies, such as initiating conflict resolutions and goal settings as networks often times come with different actors with conflicting interests. Moreover, networks are not completely sovereign or separated from the public sector as state agencies are oftentimes a key actor within network constellations. In fact, network governance is often a mean for the “enabling state” to add measures and decrease costs to public issues. As distinguished from networks to govern societies on their own, networks are better understood as the interaction between state and society to amplify coordinated means to tackle an issue which could not be delivered separately in the same manner, thus working in creating a synergy of various actors and each of their capacities (Pierre and Peters 2005:69). Governance network theory oftentimes include aspects which are the main characteristics in networks: an independence among the interdependent actors, continuing interaction and trust among the network and a significant degree of autonomy from the state governance (Davies 2011:13).
The concept of networks is thus a central one for understanding interactions between society and government, communities, organizations or other actors in governance. It is furthermore the linkages between these actors which is what creates a network. The way the linkages are set up and the type of nodes which creates a network is interesting to study using a network governance theory (Kenis 2016:149). Network governance theory consequently offers a theoretical understanding of the collaborative aspects and complexities in addressing problem solving which includes aspects which differ to the top-down policy reforms of the state. As such, it offers crucial aspects in the understanding of new governance strategy initiatives, such as public-private sector collaborations (Klijn and Copperjan 2012). In analyzing which constellations of network governance prevails in the social provision in Denver, network governance theory will provide aspects such as exploring the nodes (actors) and links (relationships) (Kenis 2016:152) in this case study to help in exploring the cross-sector interactions give insights in what type of network is prevalent between CSR and local priorities.

**Interactive Governance**

In ‘Interactive Governance and Governability: An Introduction’, Kooiman et al. (2008) presents a central concept of governance which will be used as a framework in this thesis. Interactive governance refers to the solving of societal issues through cross sector interactions. Here, governance network theory is one analytical approach of interactive governance which follows the assumption that modern societies are steered by various governance efforts (Kooiman et al. 2008:2). While different sets of governance can affect the ability for a governance system (GS) to govern a societal entity, there may also be external factors which influence the ability which lays outside the control of governance systems (Kooiman et al. 2008:2). Thus, the governing system of societal areas are affected by the nature of the societal area, the governing system and interactions of governance all together which makes the societal system which are characterized by core features such as diversity, complexity and dynamics.

The interactive governance framework analyzes governance using three key concepts: elements, modes, and orders, which are three concepts which acts within the diversity, complexity and dynamics of the societal issue in question. This framework, illustrated below, has been chosen for this thesis as it specifically provides a toolkit to explore the interaction between actors as the fundamental basis of governance theory. This aspect is useful for this thesis as the aim of the thesis is looking at the interaction and interplay of CSR and local priorities. Interactive governance pays attention to the reciprocal aspects in governance, which
materializes between governance modes and governance elements. The framework will be used as a multidimensional tool in structuring and guiding the analysis of local CSR and cross sector interactions from the empirical data collected through interviews and other secondary data. The interactive governance framework presents governance as operating in three governance orders which can be conceptualized as three levels of abstractions and goes from the first order (day to day problem solving), second order (institutional order) and meta-order, where norms are created and upheld. This thesis will only include the first two governance orders due to limitations of the study and to maintain the focus of the aim of the study. Thus, this study will use the concepts presented by Kooiman in analyzing governance through elements (images, instruments and action), modes (self-governance, co-governance, hierarchical governance) and governance orders (first and second) to study the welfare and CSR activities carried out by public and private actors in Denver.

**Limitations**

While Kooiman’s framework offers comprehensive tools in analyzing governance systems, the framework has rarely been applied in previous empirical studies. In fact, in a study on the Lake Malawi fishery published in 2010, the authors state that it is the first empirical study which operationalization Kooiman’s theory (Löf 2014:25). Another study which has used and developed the theoretical framework is Löf in ”Challenging Adaptability - Analysing the Governance of Reminder Husbandry in Sweden” where Löf both acknowledge the difficulty in operationalizing a rarely used framework in an empirical case study but also welcomes the explorative potential of the framework which through the complexity of the framework makes the different opportunities to apply it almost limitless (Song & Chuenpagdee 2010:237). In the next chapter, a general description of central concepts within the interactive framework will be carried out, followed by an operationalization inspired by Löf’s operationalization of Kooiman’s interactive governance framework in the article ‘Locking in and Locking out: a critical analysis of the governance of reindeer husbandry in Sweden’, although modified slightly for the limitations and purpose of this thesis, as mentioned previously and relates to the operationalization of governance orders.

**Images, Instruments and Actions Across Orders**

A brief description of the three central concepts of interactive governance will be presented below followed by a chapter with the operationalization and conceptualization of the framework. In the interactive governance framework, elements are one main concept and
consists of images, instruments and action. Images are the basic assumptions of governance. Here, the basic view of the societal issue of actors but also the basic view of the government’s role is included. Images consist of the visions, goals and facts of societal issues of the actors involved in the specific governance of the issue. Instruments refer to the linkage between actors’ images and their action. Instruments can be soft tools of action, such as information, taxes, incentives e.g. but they can also be hard tools, such as force of action. Depending on the actors’ position in society, their choice of instruments can vary significantly. Action refers to when governance act according to the images and instruments prevailing which includes the implementation of actions as per the goals set by actors.

The second concept presented by Kooiman et al. (2008) in the interactive governance framework is the concept of orders of governance. Orders of governance are presented as the layers of an onion where the first order governance is the outer ring of the onion peel and the middle ring being second order governance and finally, the inner ring is the third order governance. The orders of governance as described by Kooiman et al. (2008, 7) consist of three orders whereas the first order of governance refers to the day-to-day affairs of governance and takes place every time various actors interact when trying to solve societal issues. First order governance starts with identifying problems and suggesting solutions. Here, the diversity, complexity and dynamics of the issue must be taken into consideration. Second order governance refers to the institutions (norms, rules, agreements, roles) of the governance settings. Institutions make up the components of the first order governance in terms of setting up the capacity and foundations of the day-to-day affairs.

Modes of governance refers to three categories of governance modes: self-governance, cogovernance, and hierarchical governance, as presented by Kooiman (2003) and refers to how actors participate in various governance interactions. In this thesis, modes of governance will be evaluated by evaluating and mapping out public/private actor interactions in local CSR and public-sector activity in social issues as expressed by interviewees participating in this study. Self-governance refers to when actors govern themselves without the range of government. Co-governance is the joining of actors to achieve a common purpose and specifically refers to organized interaction of governance systems. Here, public-private partnerships, network governance regimes and collaborative governance are examples of co-governance modes. Hierarchical governance refers to the traditional way of governing systems and refers to the top-down governance of society. While the hierarchical governance mode has been pushed
away by market ideas and new, horizontal settings of governance, the state often times remain a central part of governing societies. In practice, most GS include both public and private actors and occur in various constellations (Löf 2016:428).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orders of Governance</th>
<th>Governing Elements</th>
<th>Governance Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Images:</td>
<td>Self-, Co-, or Hierarchical Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Images</td>
<td>—“—”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Instruments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Instruments</td>
<td>Self-, Co-, or Hierarchical Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Instruments</td>
<td>—“—”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operationalization**

One of the few empirical studies which use the interactive governance framework is Löf’s operationalization of Kooiman’s interactive governance framework in the article “Locking in and locking out: a critical analysis of the governance of reindeer husbandry in Sweden”. Löf’s article has been proven helpful in operationalizing the interactive governance framework and conceptualizing the different levels of abstraction, orders, of the framework into a more comprehensive model, essentially connecting orders, modes and elements. Furthermore, Löf acknowledges the lack of empirical studies using the framework in the operationalizing chapter and discusses the vagueness of certain concepts in Kooiman’s introduction of the framework (Löf BI) which is another reason to reference Löf in operationalizing the levels of abstraction and cross references of the framework.

As the basic theoretical foundation of governance is the leading on collective action in both identifying and acting towards achieving a collective goal (Torfing et al. 2011). Combining the second order (institutional order) of governance and images, the institutional images can be described as what decides the rules of participation in governance structures and the openness of the ability for actors to participate in governance. Here, co-governance would be expressed by the government sharing resources and powers with other actors and hierarchical governance would be expressed as top-down delegation of powers and a closed opportunity for outside governmental involvement. The first order, the operational order and images are conceptualized as the operational images of governance which refers to the problem-solving
activities which are expressed by governing goals. Here, co-governance is expressed by the goals which are organized between actors while the hierarchical governance is expressed by goals determined by the government in a top-down manner while self-governance is the internally decided goals of each actor. First order instruments, operational instruments, are the part of a governance system which is referred to as the practical means and includes the legitimizing of resources or if resources are perceived as legitimate by other actors within the governance system. Self-regulation would be expressed as resources by individual stakeholders, co-governance is when a governance system includes multiple actions which shares resources between themselves in partnerships. Hierarchical first order instruments are expressed by resources being surveillance and oligarchy distribution of resources with e.g. expert knowledge being an example of such resource distribution. Second order instruments, or institutional instruments are the elements that regulate sociopolitical interactions and the legitimizing mechanism in a governance system. In institutional instruments, self-governance is expressed by voluntarism, co-governance is expressed by shared resource distribution in partnerships and hierarchical governance is expressed by a legitimate authority. Lastly, action is the theoretical concept which connects images and instruments and decides the actions which are implemented and those which are not. Löf stresses that the action could be described from the ideal modes of governance, where self-governance is individual self-management, cogovernance expressed by coordination and hierarchical governance understood as coercion and incentivizing action (Löf 2016:430).

Löf’s operationalizing and conceptualizing of the multidimensional linkage between elements, orders and modes gives the foundation to the operationalization for this thesis although slightly modified for the purpose of this thesis. One example of modification is leaving out the metagovernance level of orders from this study, a choice which is done due to two arguments, one being that the meta-governance governance order does not necessarily bring more information which would help to answer the purpose of the study and secondly due to the scope of this thesis being restricted in terms of the time and length of the paper.
Research Design, Methods and Materials

To answer the research questions, qualitative semi structured interviews have been conducted as there is no available data already existing to help answer the purpose of this study. Some benefits of qualitative interviews are the ability to get deep insights into the understanding of the phenomenon from the interviewees. In order for the interviews to be productive and to provide information which will be able to answer the research aim, two interview guides have been created (Arthur et. al. 2014:149) - one for individuals representing corporations and one for the public-sector representatives (see Appendix). The reason there must be two interview guides is because the information needed for the purpose of the study differs among the public-sector representatives and the private sector representatives. From the public-sector interviews, the public-sector engagements and their views on the private sector in social issues and identified social issues will be identified. In the private sector interviews, different engagements, motives and collaborations will be explored. The interview guides have been designed with the purpose to lead the interviews, stay on relevant subjects, and to avoid generic replies. The theoretical framework has been carefully considered when creating the interview guides, structuring questions around central concepts of governance such as the interactions in cross-sector collaborations. As such, the theoretical framework was central in formulating the questions in the interview guide to gather the empirical data.

Selection of Case

A qualitative case study has been carried out in this thesis in order to answer the aim of the study as a qualitative research approach offers a wide range of methodologies that can be utilized to study almost any event in society. This thesis aims to explore the cross-sector interactions in CSR and how CSR corresponds to local priorities which is defined as a case study as it aims to explore a certain case. Furthermore, the aim is to analyze and understand the patterns of interactions which occur between the public sector and private corporations. To do this, semi structured interviews have been conducted with representatives from both sectors to gather insights on the cross-sector interactions. Despite that many previous studies on CSR have utilized a quantitative research approach it is here relevant to use a qualitative research approach as the aim of the thesis is not to quantify or measure certain events but to explore interactions regarding CSR and local government. A qualitative research approach can be defined using multiple ways but often times depict views and opinions of people that are relevant in regard to the aim of the study. Furthermore, a qualitative research approach may
offer insights and explanations which would not appear from a quantitative research approach. Moreover, there is not one fixed approach for a qualitative methodology, but the essence is the analysis of non-quantifying data. Instead, it is relevant to utilize the qualitative approach when aiming to answer research questions which aim to explore and understand certain societal events (Yin 2011:15-25).

As previously touched upon, the reason to why the city of Denver is an interesting case to study regarding cross sector interactions is mainly due to the taxation and spending cap under the Colorado State Constitution Revenue limitations commonly known as TABOR. TABOR is the most restrictive tax and spending cap in the United States as it limits the government revenue to the population growth and inflation index. Effectively, this means that any raise in taxes which exceed the growth in population and inflation index needs to be approved by the citizen of Colorado by voting unless declared emergency (Colorado Fiscal Institute 2019). Thus, governments operating under the most restrictive tax and spending cap may face additional challenges due to these limitations in providing services to its constituents, making various governance solutions an especially interesting aspect to study under TABOR. Furthermore, CSR is an increasingly growing phenomenon as consumers and stakeholders are increasingly demanding responsible business practices. Combining the two aspects of social provision, this study may provide some general insights in the cross-sectional interplay and market-based solutions in social provisions.

However, as studying interactions may depict very complex cross sector relations, it is impossible to say that this study will indefinitely lead to generalizations on public-private relations in all areas in society. However, there may be certain aspects in this study which may be new and useful in terms of being relevant in other areas or settings such as understanding the cross-sector dynamics in social issues in the midst of the growing privatization of welfare areas which is occurring in many societies today. In fact, most case study researchers do use the relevance of their work in assessing the generalization of the study (Hammersley, Foster and Gomm 2000:99). In this analysis, there will be an attempt to discuss the relevance of this thesis and on the liberalization of welfare provision in a Swedish context. Another aspect which has been considered throughout the research process regarding the generalization of the empirical study is the scale of the issue at hand. The welfare provision in a large city is an extremely complex area which makes data collection that include all individual pieces impossible to include under the time limits of this thesis. Many times, cases are large and
complex which is why case studies oftentimes investigate particular aspects of the wider issues where the findings are generalized to the larger scale of the case (Hammersley, Foster and Gomm 2000:103).

Validity and Reliability
One important aspect of qualitative research is to secure the validity and reliability of the study to make sure that the research is carried out in both a transparent and in a methodical manner. One additional limitation of this study is that a qualitative research approach will always be interpreted by the researcher which may lead to the researcher unintentionally ascribing further meanings to events described by the participants of the study (Yin 2011:23). The validity of the research process is ensured when the research method has been documented and that all is data available for scrutiny if requested. This study has attempted to ensure the validity of the data by informing the interview participants on the purpose of the study, by carefully transcribing the data and by sending each participant the transcripts of their interviews for them to review their answers. Furthermore, the reliability of the research is carrying out the research process in a methodical way which includes following a structured analysis and to avoid mistakes caused by a non-structured research approach (Yin 2011:31-32). This includes the notion that the researcher must be aware of eventual preconceptions and that they should purposely avoid skewing or analyze data come up with a certain result.

Data collection
To answer the purpose of the study, qualitative semi structured interviews have been conducted with Denver based companies of different sizes regarding their local social engagements (CSR) and their collaborations or interactions with the public sector in CSR. The first step to identify Denver based corporations and businesses for the study was to search for various internet records (such as Zippia.com) which display lists of the largest corporations that are operating in Denver. From there, each company’s website was evaluated to identify which companies are actively engaging in CSR engagements on a local level. Many US corporations have “CSR”, “Corporate Citizenship”, “Community Engagements” or “Sustainability” reports which was used to identify which corporations engage locally. The local engagements will be found by searching for the keywords “Denver”, “Colorado” in the reports. From there, the corporations were contacted regarding participating in interviews on their local social engagements and CSR activities. The individuals that chose to participate in interviews were also asked to refer the researcher to other individuals in corporations that they believed would
be relevant to interview for the purpose of this study. The public-sector interview participants were contacted and identified from reaching out to the City and County of Denver in a general inquiry to ask for contact information to public sector representatives that would have knowledge in these areas. Once the first interview with the public sector had been conducted, the participant referred other individuals which they believed to be resourceful for this research. As such, this study has used both a purposeful sampling and a snowball sampling method to find participants for the interviews.

A total of seven interviews have been conducted, three interviews with public sector representatives; 1) a councilperson for the City Council of Denver, 2) Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for Denver City Council’s Safety, Housing, Education and Homelessness Committee and 3) a public high school employee have been interviewed from the public sector. The interviews that have been conducted with the public-sector interviewees have been conducted to get insights on social issues and cross sector collaborations in Denver and to get their view on how local corporate engagements correspond to the public-sector engagements and priorities. Additionally, three interviews have been conducted with individuals working for Denver based corporations where the interview participants are working in the CSR work of the company. The corporations that have participated in this study are 1) Joe Verrengia, the Global Director of Corporate Social Responsibility for Arrow Electronics, 2) Allison Coppel, Director for Social Responsibility and Chief of Staff to EVP of Sustainability and External Relations for Newmont Mining (now Newmont Goldcorp) and 3) Taz Romaine-Mann, Co-Owner and Fleet and Facilities Coordinator for Namaste Solar. The interview guide created for the private sector interviewees consist of questions regarding their motives, goals and regarding their CSR activities. The final interviewee is Kirsten Vermulen, Executive Director of B:CIVIC, a Denver based organization made for professionals and business leaders to engage in CSR where the private sector interview guide was applied, although slightly modified to fit the role of the interviewee and to receive general insights on CSR work in Denver. Finally, the seven interviews were transcribed, and the data was analyzed and coded using the theoretical framework as a guiding tool for the material.

**Ethical Considerations**

The research process from start to finish must be done with ethical considerations in mind to ensure the protection of any sensitive material and of participants. There is a broad consensus on which ethical considerations need to be considered throughout the qualitative research
process with interviews as the data collection as presented by Webster, Lewis and Brown (2014:78). One ethical consideration is the principle of informed consent, where interview participants should be informed about the aim of the research and how their interviews will be used. Here, the voluntary aspect should also be presented and the fact that interviewees can change their minds about the participation at any time, even after the material has been gathered, and their data will be completely left out of the study. This is an aspect which has been considered throughout this study from the start where representatives were contacted, stressing on the voluntariness of the participation, their thoughts on having the interviews recorded and informing about if at any time if they would be hesitant to participating that the material would not be used in this study. The interviewees were furthermore informed on the background of the study and their right to be anonymous if they do decide to participate in the interviews whereby one participant did not want their name to be in the study. Before starting the interviews, the informed consent was repeated again. Finally, the interview participants were sent the transcripts for them to approve the quotes before utilizing them in the study.
Analysis

**Governing Images**

**Institutional Images**

Institutional images, or images on the second order of governance, refers to the rules of participation and is connected to the openness or closeness of the opportunities to participate in a certain governance system. The first part of the analysis will thus focus on conceptualizing the setting in where the public sector on hand act in providing social welfare for the constituents and on the other hand are the contexts which explain the rules of participation for the private sector to have a CSR policy and what factors have lead up to the current situation. To do this, previous literature on both the US welfare system and on CSR will be analyzed following Colorado-specific settings which are expressed in the interviews as playing a role in the current situation. The US which is often referred to as a liberal welfare state in such that the welfare system is shaped in a setting with liberal norms which has led to welfare benefits as provided by the state as a restrained one and furthermore is encouraging the private sector to offer alternatives to state provided welfare benefits (Esping-Andersen, 1998). In a US context, the public actor is as such already not the only actor in providing resources towards social needs. This means that the opportunities for corporations to engage in social issues are open and welcoming for the private sector and corporations specifically to participate. Previous research on CSR in the US furthermore shows that on the national level, federal agencies, such as the federal Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, are pushing a ‘CSR agenda’ which is encouraging corporation and businesses to engage in CSR in order to advance in social and environmental innovations (Camilleri 2017). In the US, both corporations and individuals are able to get tax deductions on a range of donations and engagements as long as the donations are approved by the IRS. Charitable contributions which can be deducted is monetary or property donations to the following causes: religious organizations, different government agencies on all national levels, approved nonprofits and out of pocket expenses in volunteering (IRS 2018:3).

Again, unique to Colorado is furthermore Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado State Constitution Revenue limitations is a tax legislation which has been in place since the 1990s and is commonly known as TABOR, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights. TABOR is the most restrictive tax and expenditure limit in the US (Colorado Fiscal Institute 2019) and decides that in general, the rate of growth of Colorado state revenues is limited accordingly to population
growth and inflation index. TABOR means that in Colorado, state revenues which exceed the equation of limitation as described above must be returned to the citizens of Colorado. Furthermore, TABOR limits the possibilities for the state’s General Assembly to raise taxes (unless in a declared emergency) which means that in practice all tax raises must be voted and approved by the people of Colorado (State of Colorado 2018:34).

” I think Denver, Colorado in general is a really interesting model of that because of our taxation system and how we don’t really have a high tax rate. I’m not from Colorado so I talked to my parents about what they pay in taxes compared to what we pay and it's just crazy. I mean we have the lowest spending rate in education across the country (...) so any time there is a proposition to increase taxes, most of the time it gets voted down. Now we have holes in the roads, and horrible education and privatization of our education and people are like “why is it so bad?” and we’re like “well, we need money!” – Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for the City Council

Simultaneously, despite Corporate Social Responsibility being a voluntary activity, corporations are increasingly participating in society through CSR strategies as providing an aspect which is important to stakeholders such as employees, investors and customers. As sound business practices may be connected to higher levels of economic performance and as citizen are becoming more aware of their purchases, the arena for corporations to engage socially could be beneficial in numerous ways as long as the daily business activities remain profitable. Carroll (2016) states that despite there not being any laws which forces corporations to engage in social issues, many corporations faces external expectations and desires from civil society which makes corporations engage in additional social work other than basic ethical responsibilities of corporations such as obeying the law and not engaging in harmful activities. As such, CSR is viewed a philanthropic activity which is expressed from corporations choosing to engage in communities and responding to external and internal demands from stakeholders, employees and civic society. These internal and external expectations have led to corporations more and more are implementing social responsibilities in their business strategy. Kirsten Vermulen, Executive Director with B:CIVIC retails about the recent shift in external and internal expectations on corporations and how corporations are responding to these:
“It is a “yes and”. Clearly, companies of all sizes need to be profitable to stay in existence and to keep their employees employed and to continue to innovate. However, the expectations of consumers, employees and investors have shifted dramatically, so... It's important that companies are expressing their purpose in everything they do. Ultimately, that is what corporate social responsibility is - a manifestation of that company’s purpose. Their corporate social responsibility, when well executed, align with that corporate, it compliments that corporate so it’s an authentic connection to why the company exists and the corporate social responsibility element of that strategy or an extension of that work.” – Kirsten Vermulen, B:CIVIC

In assessing the landscape and the key actor’s rules of participating in addressing social issues in Denver it is evident that the welfare system and business climate in the US makes it beneficial for corporations to engage in social issues. Government actors throughout all levels in the US, as in many other nation states, are looking into solutions on how to govern society in a setting where the private sector is getting increasingly included in providing social security both through implementing deregulations and incentives for corporations to engage. Furthermore, corporations are witnessing external and internal factors in engaging in their communities by both stakeholders and customers who desire a responsible business strategy. Despite underplaying views and motives, Denver is a city in both national and regional setting where both the national welfare system is significantly open towards the public sector’s engagements but also in a regional setting where tax restraints are affecting the city's ability to solely solve issues where there is a need for additional resources. TABOR is making Colorado a unique case as the tax revenues of the government is extremely limited and a reason to opening up the arena for corporations to provide solutions and innovation towards battling social issues. CSR can also be beneficial for the corporations from financial, public relations and a profitable point of view as long as the main goal of maintaining a profitable business, corporations are expressed as having little to lose by participating in addressing social needs.

As such, this GS shows that there is a dominance of co-governance in the institutional images in addressing social issues in Denver between private and public sector. The public sector on all levels of governance in the United States indicates that the public sector is and have increasingly been granting access to the private sector, both individuals and corporations in welfare services and that governments are increasingly incentivizing other channels than the
public sector in addressing social issues and other welfare services throughout. The institutional images, or the rules of participation in addressing social issues indicates an open GS where other actors than the state or government actors have an ability to participate in addressing social issues.

Operational Images
The operational images are the day to day problem solving actions of the actors which is directly connected to the goals and visions of the actors. The empirical data material shows that goals and objectives in this GS are decided both with and without collective agreement but there are commonly occurring patterns which reflect the self-governance of corporations as the governance mode most apparent in the governing elements of social needs in Denver and where objectives and goals of engagements are ultimately decided internally by each actor within the GS. However, there are also data which point towards expressions of both hierarchical governance and co-governance modes in this case of GS which was expressed in the data when addressing the affordable living situation in Denver. The biggest social issues in Denver which the City and County of Denver is focusing on right now are affordable housing, livable wages, homelessness and transits and mobility which are the main current political campaign issues in Denver. One example of a top-down initiative where the public sector is responsible for the goals and visions and private corporations as the implementing actor was expressed in interviews with representatives from the public sector when speaking of affordable housing. As Denver is one of the fourth most rapidly growing cities in the US, the demand for affordable housing is significantly pressing. Half of all household renters in Denver pay more than 30% of their income for housing and almost a quarter spend more than 50% of their salary on housing. Denver housing prices have increased around 50% since 2010 which is affecting the situation for many Denver inhabitants (Denvergov.org 2019). To combat the affordable housing issue, the City and County of Denver implemented a fee system which gives building contractors either the opportunity to reserve a certain percentage of buildings to be affordable housing apartments or to pay a small fee which goes towards a fund for affordable housing, thus an expression of hierarchical governance through the public sector trying to get the private sector onboard in solving the affordable housing issue which the City and County of Denver is battling. Emily Lapel, legislative analyst for the Denver City Council provided insights on a range of operational images from the City and County of Denver and the means of achieving goals and visions of the public sector. The penalty which contractors may choose to pay when developing buildings goes to the city’s affordable housing fund which the city of Denver can
use to purchase land, provide housing vouchers and eviction support for Denver citizen. The contracting penalties thus practically function in a similar way as collecting additional funds for the city to provide social services without actually collaborating with the private sector which is an expression of traditional hierarchical governance mode. As such, private contracting corporations can choose to either pay the fees and provide additional funds for the public sector to provide housing services for its constituents or they can choose to be the implementing tool in providing a service on the behalf of the public sector by choosing other incentives which the public sector has the legislative power to offer. There are also more voluntary means in development which is the result of the city of Denver incentivizing developers in building affordable housing units which could be an expression of a cogovernance solution as the private actors are incentivized in providing a service for the public actors:

” Affordability is a big issue because it’s so desirable to live here right now. And so, the city is partnering a lot with private sector developers to try to get them to build affordable housing. (...) Most developers opt out to just pay the linkage fee and not build the affordable units, and then another one that council members are using are overlays, so they’ll use height incentives, so... Say the maximum height this building can be is eight stories. But if you build ten percent of the units as affordable housing, we will let you go to eleven stories. So, those sorts of things. So, it’s incentivizing but it’s not mandatory.” - Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for the Denver City Council

Thus, this is an expression of the two sectors not necessarily sharing goals but that the operational images in initiating action across the GS by implementing both soft and hard tools of action which is decided by the government’s position in society. This could be expressed as a mean for the public sector to share goals across the governance system. As the city still holds legislative power over business practices, these are two examples of the different expressions of incentives in providing social services. There are moreover multiple expressions of where the public sector is more closely collaborating with corporations to address social issues by structurally sharing objectives and goals within the GS through various initiatives, such as the Business Improvement Districts or various already implemented public private partnerships within other policy fields which is something that is starting to become more popular in the provision of social services in Denver as well. Considering the voluntariness of CSR, the public
sector is increasingly trying to find new ways of collaborating closer with the private sector in solving social issues which the public agencies cannot provide by itself. One aspect where the data shows an expression of co-governance is when participants discussed business improvement districts (BIDs). Business improvement districts are quasi-governmental organizations initiated by businesses coming together, raising the taxes on their own business and dedicating the income of the extra tax funds towards the communities in which they operate in. The City and County of Denver has a limited amount of taxpayer funds which are allocated to BIDs that are a subdivision of the state to ensure that the public perception of BIDs is good. Ultimately, the business improvement districts are created and run by corporations to respond quickly to changes in the community which can create more attractive business districts for the corporations and can be seen as supplemental to the services which the City and County of Denver is already providing to the community (Gallagher 2014). BIDs can therefore be viewed as an expression of co-governance entity where the City and County of Denver holds the ultimate power in approving budgets and in assuring that the BIDs are viewed positively through the eyes of the constituents but are run by businesses as a way of improving their business districts which is implying a case of cross sector synergy from both sectors, decided through collective agreement and bargaining between sectors despite that they may have different end goals of engagements. Lapel, legislative analyst for the Denver City of Council paints a picture of corporate engagements as filling a gap in the public provision of social services:

“... They’re filling the gap that the city isn’t providing for them because Denver has such low tax rates, we can't provide a lot of services that other cities provide for their constituents or businesses. So, the business joins together, charge each other additional taxes level based on their real estate and then use that funding to create a business improvement district. And each business improvement districts are a little bit different.” – Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for the Denver City Council

Despite signs of both co- and hierarchical governance mode, the dominant operational image mode in this GS is expressed through the self-governance of businesses to engage in social issues. On one hand, businesses that choose to engage in CSR can do so due to a number of factors, other than ultimately providing a social service for Denver citizens. Corporations can choose to engage due to philanthropic values within the company or as part of the business model or mission statement, thus being an aspect deeply embedded in the corporate mission.
Data from interviews with the private sectors indicates that there are both expressions of purely philanthropic and mission driven types of CSR within the private sector. Corporations can also choose to engage in social issues due to publicity, public relations and consumer desires or as a mean to advance employee skills. The data shows indicators of self-governance, expressed when corporations are doing CSR due to external expectations or for the purpose of internal benefits such as doing CSR as an employee benefit where employees get to both engage in issues they care for at the same time as the employees may be learning new skills which is positive for the business. Other corporations see engaging in their communities as obvious in a sense where the location of the business and the well-being of their communities it operates in as crucial. Regardless of the motives, the data from corporate participants indicate that CSR engagements are ultimately completely dependent on the success of the business and that they define goals and participation of CSR internally. If corporations are not successful in their business, CSR engagements would suffer since resources such as money and time to carry out social projects are available due to having a profitable business. As such, corporations are mainly expressed as being self-governed as there are no legally binding agreements between corporations and government actors which would specifically force corporations to engage in various social issues. Instead, CSR is dependent on the success of the business and in turn CSR can also be a means to participate in social issues. Allison Coppel, the Director of Social Responsibility and Chief of Staff to EVP of Sustainability and External Relations provided insights in how Newmont Mining (now Newmont Goldcorp) thinks about its community investment in the Denver, Colorado area, where its global headquarters is located. Coppel states that Newmont Mining previously had a more philanthropic presence in Denver that included grant money available where organizations could apply for donations. When reviewing its community investment approach for the Denver area in 2013 and 2014, the company decided to focus more on the communities surrounding its mining operations. This is an expression of how corporations are increasingly embedding their CSR or community investment to align with their business. Newmont Mining primarily views community investment around Denver as one of their employee benefits which includes volunteering time and matching gifts where the corporation matches employee donations up to $5000. This is embedded in the corporation as both an employee benefit in the sense it shows their employees that the corporation which they work for also cares for the same things, but it is also a mean of allowing employees to build skills, such as team building-, project management- and networking skills. This is an expression of self-governance mode of operational images where corporations are engaging in CSR without the range of government.
“...And it’s just good for teaching you something that gives you a broader perspective, and that broader perspective you can bring back to your work, whether it’s about understanding the environment, understanding social issues, and we can hope that they would bring back that to their work in different ways, such as wondering how environmental and communities issues impact our business and start thinking more broadly about their work. But primarily it’s one of our employee benefits.” – Allison Coppel, Newmont Mining

Taz Romaine- Mann, Co-Owner and Fleet and Facilities Coordinator of Namaste Solar also describes an approach to CSR which also aligns with the previous expressions of corporations aligning their CSR with their business strategy as a whole. At Namaste Solar, they recently formalized a Volunteer Time On policy which is a mean of encoding a view within the company of time spent volunteering is as important to the company as time spent generating financial value is.

“We value, or we take a holistic perspective to the work profits, so we look at it in a couple of ways. It’s not just, you know, the bottom line financial aspect of the company but we also measure it in our ability and our impact in these areas in which we are creating and generating value for our neighbors and for our communities that aren’t necessarily represented financially. And again, we also offer it as a holistic benefit for our employees that work for the company, you know, being able to work for a mission driven company that does place high value on this type of engagements.” - Taz Romaine- Mann, Namaste Solar

This view of embedding their social responsibility as part of the DNA of the company for Namaste Solar even lead to the relocation of the corporate headquarter being based on this aspect of the company. A community partnership called The Sun Valley EcoDistrict (SVED) was a significant reason for the company to relocate to the Sun Valley Neighborhood which is located in the city of Denver. Sun Valley is the lowest income neighborhood in Denver and there is currently a sustainable redevelopment initiative which is implemented in the area, aimed to redevelop the public housing in the area (Sved.org 2019). The Sun Valley EcoDistrict is a cross-sector partnership in the redevelopment of the area and the actors in the initiatives include the City of Denver and various private actors. In relocating their headquarters to the Sun Valley Neighborhood, Namaste Solar hopes to be a viewed as a committed partner in the
neighborhood and to have opportunities to work with the Sun Valley EcoDistrict to be able to achieve a larger scalability of impact in their community work to reach more people. In 2016, the Denver Housing Authority and the City of Denver received $30 million, a grant which was allocated to SVED with the purpose of investments to the Sun Valley community.

“I have such hopes. I would really love for us to be seen as a committed partner in this neighborhood. There is a lot of work that is going on and it will be going on for a long time. And I would very much like for whenever there’s anything going on… Well personally I’d like to hope that we get to be in the conversations about what is happening next, so we can be ready… Not to impact the conversation! I don’t think we’re here to tell these local organizations what they should or should not be doing. More so to have a finger on the pulse so we can start preparing or mobilizing resources or things like that, so we can sort of have these timelines in mind, so we can be ready to jump in and really impact and lend something, some support with quicker turnaround times. Would be my ideal scenario, is that we’re directly tied in to what’s happening, so we can have that information up front and we can really leverage our own internal resources in the best way possible.” - Taz Romaine- Mann, Namaste Solar

SVED is therefore another example of the cross-sector collaboration in social issues and includes partners form the local community, business owners, public entities and property owners which includes expressed priority areas in education, jobs, open spaces, food and health, housing, energy and commercial improvements (EcoDistricts.org, 2019). The BIDs and SVED can furthermore be understood as expressions of closely interlinked network governance through the consociation of private actors working in network modes and utilizing private and local resources in internally set goals. In this, the linkages within the network constellation is expressed by formally organized CSR engagements between local corporations and the public sector. Simultaneously, the public sector continues to hold a significant role in the network governance in social provisions in Denver which is demonstrated by the notion of the city of Denver as having final power over the BIDs in ensuring the public perception of the constellations.
Images summary
In sum, we can see that operational and institutional images between CSR activities and the public sector shows signs of supplementing each other cross-sectors. The institutional images indicate that the rules of participating in the GS are open for the private sector and for corporations, showing expressions of co-governance to be able to provide certain social services at a lower cost for the city by collaborating with private corporations. In the operational images, there are signs of both hierarchical and co-governance where assertions of hierarchical governance are expressed through the public sector as incentivizing corporations to help solve highly political issues such as the affordable housing issue which the public sector is facing. Signs of co-governance is expressed through the data when speaking of BIDs that are functioning as a supplement to the services which are already provided to communities through the city but made up and governed by businesses in BIDs that are primarily accountable to the City and County of Denver and the goals and objectives are being shared across sectors. Ultimately, corporations are however choosing to engage in social issues through various motives; for profits, to serve the demands of their stakeholders, customers and in improving their communities, but the level of engagement and resources put towards social issues is dependent on the successfulness of the businesses. Moreover, as CSR activities remain to be a notion of self-governance of corporations, the linkages between the nodes (actors) within the network are not always connected. The data indicates that the linkages vary in how closely connected the nodes are in co-governing the social provisions in Denver, where the framing of visions and solutions differ among the network actors (Klijn and Koppenjan 2012:591) through the prevalence of the self-governing aspects of CSR. However, on both the operational and institutional order of images there are aspects which indicate a new solution in the implementation of public social service delivery – which increasingly relies on the private provision and cross-sector partnerships. The operational images furthermore show that the public sector is trying to share the public sector’s visions across the network by implementing fees and incentives for corporations to act in addressing the gaps where the public sector is unable to solely provide the services to meet the needs of the growing city. As such, there are both top-down vision sharing but also bottom-up initiatives through e.g. BIDs that are business initiatives in providing additional social services within their communities.

Instruments
This specific GS and the multilevel context show that there are expressions of an internal incapacity of the public sector both on a national level and in the city of Denver to provide the
services which meets the needs of the community by itself and furthermore that there are currently multiple initiatives in both sectors to collaborate more in across sector initiatives which is an expression of co-governance dominance between corporations and the City and County of Denver.

**Institutional Instruments**

The institutional instruments of a governance system are the sociopolitical interactions and are the legitimizing process in these. Fundamentally, the liberal ideology which is strongly embedded in the US has had impacts on the creation of welfare reforms which has created a welfare system with relatively unpretentious welfare benefits. This has historically opened up for market solutions in the provision of welfare, making public funded welfare a commodity and the private sector engagements a necessity for serving the needs of the constituents (Esping-Andersen 1998). The public and private sector mix in social welfare provision in the US have been occurring throughout the last 100 years. Between the 1800s and early 1900s, welfare programs were to a large degree delivered by private actors with the help of smaller subsidies from state and local government. In the 1930s, a number of state welfare programs were implemented and gained importance throughout the nation. Today, there are a number of areas, such as social programs, that are increasingly occurring by joint efforts cross sectors. To this day however, US government agencies still hold the main role in providing welfare services on both state and local level (Lowry 2012). The private sector donations to charitable causes in a number of areas such as education, health, human services and environment were at an estimated $410.02 (2.1% of US GDP) billion in 2017 and paints a picture of the large role which private sector donations play in the United States (Giving USA 2018).

Simultaneously, we have witnessed a shift from governance to governance which have opened up for new forms of governing society which includes nontraditional governing solutions to complex issues. This includes the deregulation of welfare areas to include a network of actors including private actors such as corporations in social provisions. The cross-sector action in providing social services are seen as a necessity by public sector actors but also opens up questions of accountability (Peters & Pierre 2004). One Denver specific example of opening up welfare issues to the private sector is the Social Impact Bond program. In 2016, the City and County of Denver initiated the Denver Social Impact Bond (SIB) program, which is a public-sector initiative aiming to improve the lives of the citizens of Denver and to save taxpayer funds by accepting private and philanthropic financial loan by setting up bonds.
available for the private sector; corporations, NGOs and individuals to purchase. The loans - or bonds - are either repaid to the donors if the programs are successful in achieving their goals or lost as an investment if the program does not meet the goals (Cooper et al. 2016). Having market-oriented social impact bonds which are dedicated towards social progress is a mean for the government to pursue social policies with ambiguous deadlines. The Denver Social Impact Bond program is specifically aimed to improve the lives of people living in Denver by using third party funds to streamline government based social programs (Denvergov.org, 2019). The SIBs are as such another expression of the government opening up the platform for the private sector to help the City and County of Denver to provide social services to its citizen which further legitimizes the inclusion of private sector and corporations in traditionally held government services. Another example of the city of Denver as moving from traditional government steering to new forms of governance is the Performance Based Infrastructure office (PBI), which is an initiative launched by the City and County of Denver in January 2019 which is exploring innovative means by leveraging private sector funds and knowledge in infrastructure issues in meeting the needs for Denver citizens regarding infrastructure. There are also cross sector collaborations in Denver public schools through internship programs for instance. As such, the data from public sector interviewees continuously show multiple examples of the public sector in Denver as being open and even requiring collaborating cross sector to provide benefits for its’ citizen in various traditionally held government issues, which is a sociopolitical mean that further legitimizes collaborations in social areas in Denver.

“We have what’s called social impact bonds. We put up bonds for people to purchase. The debt service is the expectation that we will save public money by investing in something, like... We use social impact bonds to invest in affordable housing… And they’re getting to be kind of a big thing, there’s a lot of cities that are doing the social impact bonds. It’s very interesting.” - Susman, Denver City Council

Moreover, data from the interviews with corporations indicates that corporations are often choosing to collaborate with other corporations or cause-specific NGOs in order for their engagements to create a broader impact. Some corporations are carefully choosing to engage in CSR which will be meaningful to the communities and where their engagements make sense in terms of aligning with their business and making an impact. When working with the public sector in social issues, corporations and businesses have to consider a number of factors, such
as avoiding partisan and political points of views. As such, corporations have to carefully align themselves with the humanitarian and nonprofit aspect of public partnerships rather than the political aspects of public partnerships to continue to ensure the profitability of the company by not aligning themselves sensitive political subjects. This may contribute in making collaborating with NGOs and likeminded corporations a more responsive action than collaborating with the public sector and is directly connected with the operational images of corporations where the profitability of the business comes first and where CSR is dependent on the success of the company. However, collaborating with the public sector may also be a mean of making the CSR engagements more widely spread and embedded as a vital role in society which is what many corporations are seeking. As such, the public sector in Denver is incentivizing, legislating or working on forming cross sector relationships in order to leverage the taxpayers funds more efficiently while the private sector is working towards making their CSR engagements more efficient by either collaborating with other businesses, NGOs, alternatively with public agencies in making their social impacts more efficient and widely applied for both philanthropic reasons, for public relations and for marketing reasons. Corporations are as such encouraged to engage in social issues through a range of incentives by a range of government agencies on multiple levels and by their own consumer expectations. In sum, the socio-political interactions behind the co-governance mode in this GS is expressed in multiple ways while the City and County of Denver still remains the key actor in providing social services while a number of service provisions are delegated to actors within the private sector; individuals, corporations and nonprofits. From a network governance perspective this is an expression of a network in which the city of Denver plays a central role.

“We try to stay kind of in the middle of the road approach where we don’t want to have to worry about managing the optics of the opportunities… or the groups that we are working with. From, again, we can only. One of the reasons that we can do this work is because we are profitable, and we are in a position where we can do this work. If we got into a position where whatever we are doing on our CSR end had a severe negative impact on the business, then that would also negatively impact our ability to continue to do good work in other areas. So, we try to pick areas that are important and that are impactful but that can be universally regarded as beneficial and don’t, kind of, put us in an area where we’re… Negatively impacting our image to certain parts of our demographic that we are trying to serve.” - Taz Romaine- Mann, Namaste Solar
The quote above gives an insight on the aspects which corporations need to consider when engaging in CSR and how the corporate image in the eyes of the consumers or communities could be negatively impacted if the corporation partners with some interests. Romaine-Mann furthermore expresses that Namaste Solar have yet to have any real opportunities in collaborating with the public sector in their CSR but that the relocation of the corporate headquarters could potentially give them a chance to participate in a local cross-sector initiative and that this would lead to the CSR work of Namaste Solar as having a larger scope and further their role in society as a community dedicated corporation. Another aspect which some corporations consider in their CSR is the sustainable contributions of their engagements. As Verrengia talks about the motivation of their CSR work, the importance in utilizing their sector specific knowledge and expertise is expressed as a vital aspect. Verrengia argues that the expertise which Arrow has in innovation could lead to a larger impact in battling social issues than simply donating funds and is why the corporation chooses to mainly focus on innovation as a solution to social issues both locally and globally and is the expert-knowledge motivation of CSR engagements:

“You know, Arrow is a very large, successful company, we do about $30 million in revenue a year. And, if the company gave me all that money, I could probably find a way to feed everyone in the world. But then, everyone would be hungry again, and the company would be gone. So, it’s not just a matter of donating money. You know, money is important, but where our power and benefit really resides is in technology. And so, when I’m able to find a nonprofit with a technology that can really help people and that they need help to make that technology better and ready for the market, that’s when we excel. Because that’s what we do for customers, so if we can apply our business expertise to these nonprofit challenges. I think that our contribution is much more powerful than simply writing a check. We engage all different parts of the company around the world, they tap into that enormous amount of expertise and market knowledge, and supplier relationships and the multiplier effect for that nonprofit is enormous, they could never afford all these services that we’re donating. And the value is much greater than the size of a check I could write as a donation. That's where I see us really exceeding now and in the future.”- Joe Verrengia, Arrow Electronics
**Operational Instruments**

The operational instruments are the practical manner in governance which includes resources and the legitimating of resource origins and distributions within the governance system. The data shows that there is a conception within the public sector as not being able to solve societal issues by itself and that there must be a collaboration across sectors in supplying resources which covers the needs of the constituents. This is a view which was expressed in the data by councilperson from Denver City Council whereby they referred to cross sector collaborations as “a new way of doing business in the public sector”. This is an indicator of the legitimizing of cross sector interaction in combating societal issues, redefining the view of social services as ultimately being a service under public sector responsibility and opens up for a perception of the private sector as necessary in addressing these issues. In this GS, the cross-sector initiatives, regulations and incentives which are employed by the City and County of Denver are expressions of both hierarchical and co-governance modes of governance. Expressions of hierarchical governance is the top-down employment of initiating cross-sector collaborations, having ultimate decision making in corporate engagements and implementing fees and incitements for corporations to engage in social issues. Expressions of co-governance is the participation of public entities are the participation in local vertical co-governance initiatives (such as the Sun Valley EcoDistrict), overseeing the business improvement districts and in overseeing corporate run initiatives such as the business districts which all have internal decision-making processes and goal settings. Furthermore, there are indicators of the public sector as viewing private provisions as necessary in a range of public areas which is another expression of co-governance and is directly connected to the openness of the arena in providing social services in the city of Denver.

Another aspect of CSR action was expressed in the data and indicates that corporations which are specialized in a certain industry are often times focusing on industry specific CSR engagements which furthers broadly legitimizes their engagements as there is expert resources at hand. Arrow Electronics is a Fortune 500 company, which means that it is one of the 500 largest corporations in the US and provides technology solutions to improve business and daily life (Arrow Electronics 2019). As such, Arrow has a focus of engaging in CSR engagements that are related to innovation, an area which they have expert knowledge in. Arrow engages in CSR through education on a local level but also by collaborating with nonprofits in developing innovative solutions for social needs not only in Denver but worldwide. Therefore, corporations can offer expert resources in making local solutions more widely applicable and
more efficient. Despite corporations choosing to engage for any given purpose, data indicates that both corporations and public-sector agencies are trying to collaborate to make a wider impact on communities. Thus, many corporations are setting the goals of their CSR accordingly to their business and industry sector to make CSR embedded in their business image to make CSR engagements make sense to employees, customers and stakeholders. This results in the goals of corporations as not always necessarily aligning with the public sector which in turn has more wide and general goals of their social provision services. The sector specific CSR in these instances are aligned with the goals of the US federal government which are pushing for more CSR to advance innovation which are aimed towards solving social issues thus not necessarily only with the local government. The governance gap here is expressed as caused by the tax restraints under the Colorado State Constitution Revenue limitations and makes corporate engagements relevant for both corporations, the public sector in Denver and to communities. Joe Verrengia, the Global Director of Corporate Social Responsibility of Arrow Electronics spoke of the role of CSR in society and pointed out that they experience is that there is noticeable desire from both public sector, nonprofits and by communities for corporations, especially larger corporations to make a positive contribution in society. Furthermore, Verrengia emphasized that the focus on the business needs to be the focal point. As such, the CSR engagements are chosen carefully as it needs to reflect the company’s values and goals. Another aspect which Verrengia points out was that the engagements need to be carefully planned as the CSR funds are limited and they do not only engage in areas connected to technology and innovation in social issues but also ensure that their engagements are aimed towards something effective for the community. These are expressions of bottom-up instruments, or tools for corporations in entering the governance system or choosing to engage in local CSR. Here, the knowledge and resources for corporate CSR is ultimately based on bottom-up stakeholder knowledge or choosing to tap on resources by other private corporations or nongovernmental organizations without the inclusion of the public sector. In the private sector, the voluntarism of CSR work remains the key tool in participating in social provisions. However, there are also expressions of the hierarchical and co-governance mode in the operational governing instruments of social provisions in this case study, especially through the various co-governance initiatives as previously discussed in this analysis such as the BIDs and cross-sector partnerships. From the public sector, soft tools such as incentives and small fees remains to be the main instruments in getting the private sector to fill the gaps of social provision which the public sector is unable to provide as the only actor. In collaborating cross sector, the scalability is seen as a desirable aspect for corporations to unite with the public
sector where the legitimization of corporate engagements, especially for smaller corporations, is emphasized through cross sector partnerships. As such, public-private collaborations in social issues are viewed as a key instrument to the government actors in providing services while corporations are employing various means of self-governance as a key instrument in CSR. The successful synergies in providing services are here mainly expressed by the public sector and B:Civic interview participants as the formal partnerships and hierarchical soft tools between the two sectors such as the affordable housing incentives and BIDs, where the City of Denver is expressed as a pioneer city in a number of private-public initiatives.

"We do have a generous culture of individual giving in the United States and that’s quite strong. In terms of government and business intersect I’m sure that others have shared with you the concept of the Impact Bonds... I think that’s a model that Denver is advancing… To me, that's one of the early successful collaboration across public and private sector specifically looking at addressing social challenges. But it has taken some time to design this kind of partnership and I think the public sector and private sector is still negotiating and determining what the best constructional models look like in terms of fair accountability there and you're probably learning that it’s very promising but also very early experiential but that's something to consider. Because Denver is one of the few communities in the United States that is as far along in this process. So that's pretty positive.” - Vermulen, B:CIVIC

**Instruments Summary**

The instruments of this GS points towards co-governance as being the dominant mode of governance. The institutional instruments express the incapacity of the public sector across the vertical governance levels and is amplified by the unique fiscal limitations of government. As such, the city of Denver has become a pioneer in employing new methods in leveraging funds and collaborating with private actors to provide services for its constituents. The Social Impact Bonds, the Business Improvement Districts and the Public Private Partnership agency are three examples in which the city of Denver is one of few cities across the US with these initiatives. Furthermore, the corporate view of the importance in engaging in CSR activities, which are closely linked with the business, is continuously expressed as a vital point. As such, corporations do not choose to collaborate with public actors in any given opportunity in social provisions. Instead, corporations primarily focus on sector-specific CSR, making NGOS that
are specified in given social issues or likeminded businesses a self-evident choice in collaborating with. Moreover, data shows that this network mode of governance may operate as a mean in this instance for the public sector in leveraging resources and cutting costs in the state provision of welfare. Therefore, CSR may be an expression of cross-sector interaction beneficial for the public sector in addressing social provisions in Denver. The cross-sector benefits could also potentially be utilized by corporations in legitimizing their CSR, towards the desires of society, by collaborating with public actors. The network could thus function as beneficial for both corporations and the public sector. However, it is mainly the public sector that is explicitly expressing the importance in partaking in this network due to perception of an internal incapacity in the provision of not only social services but also across other policy areas. The linkages between the nodes in this network are thus varied in the level of connectedness and steering in addressing social needs in Denver.

**Action**

Governance action refers to as the linkage between instruments and images and is the part of the framework which pays attention to why certain things are acted upon. In this GS, data indicates that social issues are being addressed in both public and private sector engagements and that engagements are not always co-managed but could potentially function in creating a synergy amongst the two sectors in the social provisions. The public sector - the City and County of Denver - is currently aiming to collaborate more across sectors to fill local governance gaps while private corporations wants their engagements to create as large of an impact as they can through their CSR for various reasons. Corporations are furthermore acting under the rules set by the government which is an expression of hierarchy. Simultaneously, data in this study indicates that both sectors in Denver are dependent on each other as there is a clear internal incapacity to address and implement action in various local policy fields which are fundamentally caused by limited fiscal resources for the government and the legislating power in which the city of Denver holds over local businesses, especially smaller ones that has less of an economic security. The analysis has thus far expressed that there is a view in the public sector as private inclusion in the provision of welfare is the way forward. Recent initiatives such as implementing a scrutinizing agency for public-private partnerships is also an expression of the institutionalization of cross-sector collaborations within the public sector.

However, while there is an expressed need for bringing in private actors in solving complex issues such as social services for the City and County of Denver, there is still some reluctance
among public actors in bringing in corporations to provide these services. As one interviewee expressed it, private actors are not accountable towards the constituents in the same manner in which public entities are accountable towards its constituents, which opens up deeper questions of legitimacy in the cross-sector collaborations. To maintain the accountability towards the constituents, the City and County of Denver has recently created an audit agency which is supervising the work in in public private partnerships, an approach which has just been implemented and is still being assessed internally. While partnering with corporations in various areas is becoming increasingly common in the public sector, data shows some declinations in collaborating cross sector that is largely due to accountability issues which were expressed or brought up in interviews with representatives from the public sector. This is an expression of sociopolitical reluctance in collaborating with private sector in not only this GS but throughout various government policies on the local level. The city’s answer to the accountability issues in collaborating with private corporations in Denver was by setting up an agency which scrutinizes the private public partnerships and pays attention to the cross-sector interaction in government action to ensure transparency in the process and to evaluate the engagements. As such, the public sector is searching for means to be able to remain accountable towards the citizen of Denver while creating new ways of leveraging tax funds together with private funds to ultimately supply resources which will have a wider reach in society.

“I’ll tell you, we formed this organization, or this agency, to look at other opportunities for public private partnerships. And to do the due diligence needed to understand what’s the investment, why do we need a private partner, could we do this on our own, what’s the return on the investment, how to keep everything so that it is for a public good and not for a… you know, someone in the city’s private good.” Councilperson, Denver City Council

“I think it's a slippery slope because ultimately I didn’t vote for *company*. I voted for, you know, my counsel person… I voted for the mayor… So, they’re the people that I voted for I didn’t vote for this contractor that we’re partnering with and spending my money on. Why shouldn’t I have then the say in that... Because I think it's more of the accountability mechanism...” – Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for the Denver City Council

As such, cross-sector collaborations are still facing some disinclinations from both private sector and public sector before being widely embedded in the social provisions
of welfare despite there being expressions from both sector in wanting to collaborate more across sectors. Furthermore, the self-determination of corporations in structuring their CSR are a response in the societal demands where corporations aim to implement CSR aspects in their business strategies. This results in various CSR collaborations with other actors within the private sector more often than corporations generally collaborating with the public sector. This is however in practice not expressed as an explanation in why cross-sector engagements are not more widely applied, as the public sector is often times the actor responsible in initiating cross-sector engagements which are specifically based on the needs of the city and the local priorities. In public sector initiatives, corporations from various sectors are selectively included in areas which either affect their local communities or in areas which is aligned with their business strategy alternatively makes the CSR engagements more widely spread or legitimized. The constellation of nodes and linkages within this governance system depicts a network in which multiple actors are present in providing social services in Denver. Consequently, despite that the governance system is open and that there is an expressed will in engaging in social provision from both sectors, the network is not always closely integrated or coordinated between the nodes. There is furthermore some reluctance in the inclusion of private actors in the public sector which relates to the accountability towards the constituents.

Concluding discussion

This analysis has explored the cross-sector interaction in social issues in Denver between local corporations in various sizes and the City and County of Denver by exploring the governance of social issues by utilizing network governance theory as well as the interactive governance framework developed by Kooiman - a framework which has had few previous empirical operationalizations. The study has specifically set out to analyze local CSR and how it relates to local priorities in Denver by answering three research questions. In this chapter, the research questions will be listed and followed by concluding discussions under each section.

Are private engagements addressing welfare issues as identified by the public sector?
The analysis begins by exploring the images in the governance system which indicates that the governance arena is open to cross-sector collaborations and private provisions, not only in social issues but across various policy fields. This openness is expressed on federal, state and on local levels and is furthermore embedded in the US through the institutionalized liberal state views of market-based welfare provisions. One aspect which is particularly interesting in this case study in assessing the possibilities for non-government actors in participating in the governance of social issues in is the Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR). TABOR applies to all levels of governments in the state of Colorado and is the most restrictive tax and spending cap in the United States. This has led to the various Colorado governments as being significantly restricted in funds which limits the opportunities for government policies to be implemented. This makes nontraditional governance solutions such as opening up social provisions to private sector particularly important in providing services for the citizen. In Denver, there are multiple initiatives in combating social issues and Denver could in a number of aspects be regarded as a pioneer city in exploring private solutions to welfare provision, e.g. by the quasigovernmental Business Improvement Districts and by implementing the Social Impact Bonds program. Some of these cross-sector social provision-initiatives are thus a mean for the public sector to encourage corporations to address social issues while some initiatives are coming from local corporations through bottom-up initiatives where they are choosing to engage in CSR for a number of reasons, such as purely philanthropic reasons, as an employee benefit or for PR.

The notion of governance systems in any part of society as being distinguished as solely having a self-, co- or hierarchical governance mode is highly theoretical. In practice, most GS are a combination or mix of various governance modes and often times include actors in both private and public sectors. Consequently, this study has shown a mix of constellations in governance modes in providing social services in Denver with the co-governance mode being the dominant one in many aspects as it the mode which prevails throughout all governance elements. The institutional governance order show expressions which indicate that the local government is unable to be the sole actor in providing social services for the citizen in Denver. This idea of an internal incapacity or perhaps of private practices as superior to traditional government practices is connected to the liberal welfare state and embedded throughout the US. This is furthermore expressed on a local level through the range of policy fields in which the City and County of Denver is collaborating with private actors as a mean to achieve desired end goals. Thus, this thesis shows multiple expressions of where private CSR is helping in filling the gaps of the public provision of welfare by various initiatives, such as employee volunteering,
participating in cross-sector initiatives or regulations and by bottom-up initiatives such as the BIDs. The altering images between actors in this GS may however hinder a more efficient and larger scale coordination of social provision for the most pressing social issues. One aspect of this is expressed through the interviews as the voluntary engagements which comes from corporations as not always being efficiently operationalized in society:

“I used to be a volunteer organizer for a nonprofit here in Denver and we would have corporations that sent out people to volunteer with us. It actually became a problem because we didn’t have enough stuff for volunteers to do… Because maybe they had it as a part of their wellness program, to volunteer X number of hours (…) I felt like they were just ticking off a box that they needed to tick off.”
– Emily Lapel, Legislative Analyst for the Denver City Council

The quotation above indicates that even if CSR helps in filling a gap of social provisions, CSR is not always efficiently addressing the most pressing needs of society. As such, there is certainly room to improve the public-private governance system by collaborating and interacting closer in social provisions and to articulate common goals and co-manage various CSR engagements to tackle a range of social issues. On the operational order, the social provisions are thus achieved through various ways between the two actors included in this thesis; by collaborating, top-down initiatives and by internally defined initiatives from corporations. This may be a result of the actors’ dissimilarity of images expressed by goals and views of social action. The goals of corporations sometimes differ from the goals of the local government in welfare provision whereas the profitability of the corporation will always be of higher priority to businesses. Furthermore, as corporations are engaging in CSR as a response to the increasing desire by society for corporations to engage in social issues and corporations are progressively using their industry-specific resources in addressing social needs. The consequence of industry-specific targeting of social issues may be that despite industry specific CSR initiatives could help in providing social services, CSR is not necessarily aligned with the most pressing government priorities. However, there are instances, such as the affordable housing fees, in where the public sector uses incentives or fees as a mean in sharing their goals with private corporations to utilize private resources in the provision of social services. This is an expression of the city and county of Denver as coordinating the network streamlines through top-down regulations which are implemented by the public sector and works as a mean of getting private corporations to address pressing political priorities. While that initiative is an
expression of a hierarchical governance mode, it works by getting actors within the network to address the needs which the state actor sees as pressing. This is thus one solution for the public sector to more efficiently get corporations to address the current local social governance issues and is an expression of the hierarchical governance mode in controlling the agenda within the network.

What is the interaction between public and private sector in social engagements in Denver?

There are indications which points towards the local government as being the main actor in this GS as the City and County of Denver still holds legislative power over local businesses and have the means to implement various fees or to incentivize corporate action through the legislative power that the government holds over corporations. These means are expressions of hierarchical governance in deciding social provision goals across the governance network and the corporate world as being the actors in implementing the practical provisions for the city of Denver. The images and institutional and order of governance indicates that the governance arena is open for private sector inclusion in the provision of social services and that the City of Denver is both welcoming bottom-up initiatives by corporations such as the BIDs or incentivizing corporations to address social issues by implementing fees and financial incentives in filling the gap in welfare provision which the public sector is not capable of solely addressing. The operational images depict expressions of co-, hierarchical and self-governance modes of governance where the public sector on one hand across all levels of governance in the US wants corporations to address social issues while CSR engagements remain to be motivated by the self-interests of corporations. However, the self-interests of corporations are expressed as being a response to corporate stakeholders and local society which ultimately means that despite altering motives, CSR does have a role in the local provision of welfare towards society despite not always being co-steered with the priorities of the public sector. On both the institutional and operational order of instruments, the co-governance mode is expressed as the most dominant mode of governance as local CSR and cross-sector initiatives function as a mean in which the local government can save resources. For corporations, the cross-sector initiatives may function as a mean of raising the level of scalability of local CSR where corporations can position themselves as a vital role in their local community.

This study thus indicates that this specific GS and the interaction between the two actors which have been scrutinized in this study could be distinguished as being mainly a co-governance of
social provisions as the co-governance mode is present throughout the governance elements and orders of governance within this network, despite the prevalence of all three ideal types of governance modes in this case study. In practice, the social provisions in Denver may surely include a range of other private and government actors and various cross sector collaborations which may vary in the level of formality and in the structure of these. This study has however provided insights regarding the institutional incapacity of the local government in providing social services and regarding the role of CSR and public-private interactions in welfare provisions in Denver. Although there are expressions of different goals and visions of social engagements among the two types of actors, cross-sector engagements could potentially create a synergy and function as formal system of co-governance of social provisions between CSR and public services if utilized and co-managed more efficiently. The market provision of welfare benefits in Denver may function as the way forward as long as the tax restrictions under TABOR are in place. As previously noted, cities in the state of Colorado could be referred to as extreme cases of liberal market solutions in social areas as there are financial restrictions in which the state actors may not solely meet the needs in these issues. Simultaneously, the city of Denver is growing rapidly and is currently the fifth fastest growing large city in the US which opens up for new liabilities for the local government. This is a view which was expressed by the councilperson regarding the future of cross sector collaboration in social issues in Denver and the internal incapacity of the City and County of Denver:

“It is almost, to me, it's going to be the way that we will be do business for this city because as things get more expensive and our obligations gets greater… Here’s a way that we could use taxpayers’ funds more efficiently… And leverage them with other dollars and it is probably more and more going to be the way of doing business in the public sector.” - Councilperson, Denver City Council

The quote above indicates that the cross-sector interactions in providing social services is viewed as a solution to the growing challenges which the public-sector faces by representatives within the Denver City Council. There are currently a number of initiatives which includes, and relies, on public and private sector interaction in the provision of social services, such as the BIDs which are initiated by private sector but where the public sector is responsible in ensuring the legitimacy towards its constituents by approving budgets before the BIDs can implement local initiatives. Another cross-sector interaction in providing social services is the Sun Valley EcoDistrict which is made up by public and private entities with the mission to
redevelop the Sun Valley neighborhood together with the local community. This initiative was crucial for Namaste Solar, a Denver based corporation in the relocating of its headquarter in order to amplify their CSR engagements and for the corporation to have a crucial role in that community. The public sector in Denver is furthermore collaborating closely with the private sector in some other areas, such as in infrastructure policies, in framing and sharing end goals collectively which may be the way which welfare provisions are tackled in Denver in the future. The SIBs (Social Impact Bonds) are another example of introducing the private sector in social issues and could suggests continued cross-sector interaction in the provision of social services also in the future.

What expressions of a governance network prevails in the cross-sector interactions in social provisions in this case study?

The network approach has been helpful in displaying a number of insights in the cross-sector interactions in social issues in Denver. The analysis indicates that there are both examples of social cross-sector initiatives in which the nodes (actors) are closely linked, such as formally organized private-public partnerships (e.g. BIDs) where the goals and visions of the initiatives are shared among the actors within the network. There are also expressions of less connected linkages within the network constellation where the CSR engagements may serve a role in the provision of social services but are not necessarily integrated or coordinated with the public sector. Even hierarchical connections are expressed through the top-down sharing of goals through implementing fees, as previously discussed. As such, one reoccurring aspect in this governance network is struggle in sharing images among nodes. This is a result of the internally defined self-regulations of corporations to engage in social issues. This could mean that practically, visions, goals and action are not always correlating through the linkages as the framing of goals and solutions differ among actors, an issue which often times comes with network governance as networks oftentimes includes actors with different end goals. However, the public sector remains to hold a central role within the network governance of social provisions in Denver through the top-down goal settings, which may indicate that the network is unable to work autonomously in providing social services in Denver which aligns with the arguments of Pierre and Peters (2005:68). Accordingly, this governance network is not separated from the state but could be an expression of a network working as a mean for the public sector to address political priorities and expressed through various cross-sector interactions through initiatives in providing social services between CSR and the public sector.
As such, this thesis has provided insights which points towards the social provisions in Denver as being a loosely connected network and depicts a number of initiatives in which CSR engagements can function as an institutionalized benefit for the public sector in cutting costs and adding private means towards addressing social needs. This could imply that The City and County of Denver is increasingly moving towards a more extensive inclusion of private corporations by identifying new principles for social governance and means to increasingly share political priorities across actors within the network. The institutionalization of market provision of welfare is evident as it prevails across vertical governance levels across the US and is amplified in Denver under the restrictions of TABOR. Consequently, the public sector is incentivizing corporations to provide services to address social needs and the implementation of additional government agencies in monitoring public-private initiatives points towards a view of the inclusion of private actors as being the way forward in various policy fields. There are aspects in this thesis which points towards the notion that the potential synergies in multiple streamlines of action from both public and private sector are currently not always co-directed between the nodes, which could be expressed as a governance network where the linkages are missing in some instances (Kenis 2016:155). As CSR continues to be mainly an expression of the self-governance of corporations, CSR visions are not automatically shared with the public sector. Despite that corporations and the public sector in some regards are targeting the same issues, social corporate engagements remain to be internally motivated and implemented by the private sector. As such, while the public sector has a desire in collaborating with private sector in order to province services for its’ constituents and furthermore selectively collaborates with parts of the private sector in a number of cross-sector arrangements, general CSR remains expressed as serving a role - within a loosely linked network – in the provision of social services in Denver. Ultimately, there are a number of aspect in which the governance of social provision in Denver fits the theoretical core characteristics of network governance, such as the interdependence of actors in utilizing their individual means to address social needs which the public sector is unable to tackle individually. Various public-private initiatives in addressing social issues are thus expressions of alternatives to the traditional top-down governance strategies and includes the notion of utilizing the means of the private sector in adding funds and resources and cutting costs for the public sector. Here, the public sector still plays a central role within this specific governance network in coordinating private action to address the most pressing needs in society.
Final Remarks and Suggestions for Future Research

This study has sought out to explore the cross-sectional interactions in social provision in Denver. However, due to limitations of the study a number of key actors in social provision such as individual donations and NGOs were not included in this study. Future studies should attempt to include a larger range of actors that are involved in the welfare provision in Denver. Furthermore, as this study only briefly touched upon the accountability issues of this governance system, there should be future studies which follows up the implementation of the public entities which the city of Denver recently employed with the aim of ensuring the legitimacy of public private collaborations in a number of policy fields and the results of their reviews of cross-sector interactions and how these areas have evolved in Denver. Other relevant areas of interest are in conducting comparative research between local governments in Colorado and how different cities respond to the fiscal limitations in government funding. How are other local governments under the TABOR tax restrictions answering the needs of the constituents while facing narrow limitations in government funding and what could potentially explain the difference in responses among the areas? Furthermore, the implications of tax reliefs given to corporations in some CSR engagements has briefly been touched upon in the introduction of this thesis but not scrutinized in detail. As such, the notion of private economic interests and CSR motivations could be problematized in future research.

What Can the Swedish Debate Learn from this study?

Tying back to the theoretical framework and previous governance literature and the change in how societies are governed, this thesis has expressed notions of governance as framed by Pierre and Peters (2005) as while government no longer has the sole capacity of governing and providing services in all areas traditionally held by government, the government remains an essential piece in the governance system in providing social services. Governance literature has furthermore opened up for questions regarding the legitimacy and accountability of governance solutions, which was one aspect that was considered in the case selection of this thesis and as previously stated have been topics which are prevailing in the cross-sectional provision of welfare in Denver as well. Despite this thesis being set in a US context, these are areas which are also interesting in a Swedish context as research shows that the Swedish welfare system is moving towards utilizing private provision in a range of social areas.
As studies show that Sweden is moving towards a neoliberal solution in the provision of welfare benefits in a similar manner as the dominant welfare provision across the United States. Due to the particularities around the spending and taxation restrictions as well as the strong belief in cross-sector partnerships, Denver could be described as an extreme case of employing liberal market solutions. This study has shown that despite private inclusion in welfare provisions is seen as a positive thing in many regards - especially in the fiscal savings of the local government - , this study has shown that the large degree inclusion of private actors in the traditionally held public sector area does opens up for questions of legitimacy and accountability, which furthermore corresponds with literature on governance and neoliberal welfare systems. As public provisions in Denver are converting to market dependent provisions through increased cross-sector interactions, the city of Denver is currently working on ways in which they can oversee the partnerships in various audit agencies to ensure the legitimacy of the engagements. As one interview participant put it, private corporations are not necessarily accountable to its constituents in the same manner as the public sector is. The public scrutinizing agencies recently implemented in Denver are as such an expression of how the public sector is working on ensuring the legitimacy in the governance of previously held government areas that are now opened up for the inclusion of private actors. Opening up the arena for private corporations and private interests is a mean which is seen as necessary in Denver due to the fiscal limitations of the public sector has however lead to the public sector needing to invest resources in monitoring the public-private partnerships and collaborations.

As we are witnessing Sweden moving towards a similar manner in the inclusion of private interests in traditionally held public provision of welfare, the question of how market provisions can remain accountable to the constituents remain a focal point. The aspect of public funding and accountability towards constituents was expressed by one of the interview participants in this case study. Here, the lack of corporate accountability towards constituents was mentioned as a problematizing aspect of public-private partnerships and cross-sector collaborations:

“Now, some people are in the school of thought that private sector’s managerial practices are the best practices. But I don’t think that's true in the public sector at all because you’re dealing with a whole different beast of funding and people, like a customer is one thing and a constituent is a different thing because they have a stake... And you should treat your constituents like shareholders, but I don’t think that's what happens. And so... There’s the accountability issue that I feel is there
because obviously the city is accountable to its constituents, but the private sector corporations may not be. People argue that P3 cuts costs because you don’t assume all of the risks to a large project and their great for large projects (...). But I don’t… Immediately I just get uncomfortable of the privatization of the public sector just because it gives me the creeps. It makes me feel icky.”
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Appendix.

Interview Guide for Corporative Representatives

1. Ethical considerations
   a. Describe the study
b. Voluntary aspect

c. Anonymity aspect

d. Recording

2. Introductory Questions

a. Role in the company

3. CSR Activities

a. Why does the corporation choose to engage in social issues?

b. How did CSR start?

c. Which factors are needed for the corporation to be able to perform CSR?

d. CSR in relation to the profitability of the corporation?

e. Process before engaging in a specific CSR activity?

f. What local engagements is the corporation engaged in now and what type of CSR has the corporation been engaging in previously?

4. Local CSR

a. Why engage locally?

b. Any specific circumstances which led to local engagements?

c. Are there specific people within the corporation that are working with CSR?

5. Relationship with Other Actors in CSR?

a. Does the corporation work together with other actors in local engagements?

b. Why not? / Why?

c. How did the collaboration start?

d. How do you work together? Interactions example

e. Do you work with the public sector in local CSR?

   i. Describe how you are working together

   ii. If no, why are you not working together?

6. Evaluations

a. Would you say local CSR is successful?

   i. In which ways?

b. Are there follow-ups or evaluations?

   i. Describe how

c. How will the corporation continue to perform CSR locally?

d. Hopes for the future regarding CSR?

7. Ending questions

a. Anything you wish to add?
b. Follow up if needed?
c. Anyone else I should talk to?
2. Introductory Questions
   a. Your role?

3. Social Needs in Denver?

4. Collaborations with public sector in social issues?
   a. With corporations?
   b. Why? Why not?
   c. How did collaborations start?
   d. How are you working together?
   e. Decision making processes?
   f. Difficulties in collaborating?
   g. Who initiates engagements?

5. What do you think about corporate motives in CSR?
   a. How does the public sector think about that?
   b. Hopes in future CSR engagements?
   c. Feedback in collaborating cross-sector?
   d. Evaluated?

6. Ending questions
   a. Anything you wish to add?
   b. Follow up if needed?
   c. Anyone else I should talk to?