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Developments in SM

- Total market approach
  - Individuals are not in complete control of their behaviours (Hastings 2003; Wymer 2009; Bentz et al 2005)
  - Integration of downstream, midstream & upstream
  - Incorporation of many approaches in many settings (Story, Nanney et al. 2009)
  - Need to catalyse behavioural change & social change (Smith 2000)
Emergence of Partnership approaches

Benefits of SM partnerships

- Greater reach
- Impact
- Greater co-operation
- Adoption of a network approach to sharing knowledge and resources

(Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008; French 2010)
Partnership development in SM

- Multifaceted (Butland, Jobb et al. 2009) approaches needed – relationships rather than transactions (Hastings 2009)
- Sustainable vs short term solutions (Zainuddin, Russell - Bennett et al. 2008)
- Need for high involvement and trust (Hastings 2008)
- Greater influence when synergised; add knowledge, reach & heft (Smith 2000; Thomas 2008)
- Change dependent on motivation, opportunity & ability (Rothchild 1999, Andreasen 2002)

Partnerships in Social Marketing

- Evidence of partnering since the 1970’s
  - Co-operation/ Coordination (El – Ansary and Kramer Jr 1973; Fox and Kotler 1980)
- Securing funding strategic collaborations (French 2010)
- 5th ‘P’ in the social marketing mix (Weinrich 1999; 2010)
- Frequently included in SM textbooks
Evolution of SM partnership characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downstream Characteristics Dominated until 2000</th>
<th>Total Market Approach 2000 onwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co – operation</td>
<td>Systems perspective (Goldberg 1995; Donovan 2000; Andreasen 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co - ordination</td>
<td>Strategic (French 2010; National Social Marketing Centre 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual focused (Hastings and Donovan 2002; Andreasen 1997)</td>
<td>Issue focused (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service / Product orientated (Wymer 2010)</td>
<td>Institutional change (Goldberg 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational (Goldberg 1995)</td>
<td>Integration of levels (Up/ mid/ down) (Samuels 1993; Domegan 2008; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro (Machluppen, Stead et al.1999)</td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal change (French 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term (Lefebvre and Flora 1988)</td>
<td>Longer term (Andreasen 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betterment (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
<td>Macro (Gillies 1998; Andreasen 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of SM partnerships

- Copied but poorly researched (Lefebvre 2006)
- Lack of definitions (Niblett 2005) & boundaries (Sowers, Doner et al. 2005)
- Lack of framework (Lefebvre 2009) and empirical research (Niblett 2005)
- Poor theoretical perspective (Lefebvre 2006)
Definition of SM partnerships

- No explicit definition
  
  "cover a range of relationships between two entities"  (Sower, Doner et al. 2005)

- Distinct lack of boundaries
  - Equated to unsuccessful campaigns (Ojeda, Hiller et al 2009)

- Referenced terms
  - ‘collaborators’ (Lefebvre 2009; Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009)
  - ‘coalitions’ (French 2010)
  - ‘alliances’ (Andreasen 1995)

---

SM Partnership Characteristics

- Formed for the benefit of the cause not the organisations

- Motivated and committed to working together because of common goals

- Acceptance of the role of shared resources which come in multiple forms in developing partnerships

- Knowledge that greater impact can be achieved through working together
**Taxonomies of SM Partnerships**

1. Partnership Continuum (Himmelman 2001)
2. Taxonomy of Partnerships (Legarde et al 2005)

---

**Partnership Continuum**

- Categorises partnerships on a continuum:

1. Networking – exchange for mutual benefit
2. Co – ordination – info exchange and plans to achieve goals
3. Co – operation – Sharing of resources
4. Collaborating – organisations enhancing the capacity of partners for mutual gain

Source: Himmelman (2001)
### Taxonomy of partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NGO – NGO</th>
<th>NGO – NGO</th>
<th>NGO – NGO</th>
<th>NGO - Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Absent, low or conflicting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convergence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of trust</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Contract</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Classification of social marketing partners

Source: Hastings (2003; 2007)
Key SM partnership Variables

- Higher order

  - **Relationship commitment** (Hastings and Saren 2003; Legarde et al 2005; McDermott, Stead et al. 2005; Smith 2006)


Key SM partnership Variables

- Lower order

  - **Shared values** (Crutchfield and Grant 2008; Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009; Sowers 2005; Temple Long et. Al 2008)

  - **Non – material benefits** (Binney, Hall et al. 2005; Crutchfield and Grant 2008; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Long, Taubenheim et al. 2008)

Key SM partnership Variables cont.

**Motivation** (Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Thomas 2008)
- **Co – operation** (Anderson and Narus 1990; French 2010; Hastings and Saren 2003; Rothschild 1999)
- **Tension** (Niblett 2005; Thomas 2008; Weinreich 1999; Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2000)

Relational Thinking within SM

- Proposed by Hastings (2003; 2007)
- Relationship thinking can enhance social marketing:
  - Building trust and commitment
  - Satisfaction
  - Long term versus intermittent change
  - Engagement and mobilisation
  - Discrete vs long term transactions (Morgan and Hunt 1994)
Morgan and Hunt’s KMV model

Proposed SM Partnership model
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