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Abstract

The type of transformational change needed to address the complex and wicked issues that permeate today’s society cannot be facilitated without the adoption of multi-sectoral social marketing partnerships. This research, undertaken in the field of public health, identifies the challenges faced by social marketers when embarking on a partnership approach to social change. A dynamic solution is presented through the conceptualisation of the social marketing partnership entity. As no theoretical definition of social marketing partnerships currently exists, the identification of key social marketing partnership characteristics became a central outcome of this research.

Through the extension of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model a social marketing partnership framework was developed which infused the social marketing and relational marketing paradigms. Trust and commitment are identified as central to the development of sophisticated social marketing partnerships, their presence acting as precursors for long term cooperation. The role of three additional constructs in the social marketing partnership process were intensified, namely shared values, communication of expectations and cooperation.

This research contributes to an understanding of the skills required to strategically select, evaluate and maintain sustainable social marketing partnerships for social innovation in Irish society when addressing wicked issues. The type of systemic change needed calls for a long term visionary approach working across departmental, organisational and sector boundaries, and therefore is enhanced through the existence of this social marketing partnership framework. These skills enable managers to broaden the pool of potential partners related to the social marketing issue whilst differentiating between stakeholders. From a strategic transformational perspective, this social marketing partnership framework also offers guidance on how to co-build structures and institutional rules, enabling access, engaging people and exemplifying desired changes.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Social marketing partnerships are pivotal to a more sophisticated and comprehensive understanding of ways to formulate and shape social change strategies and as a result have been widely accepted as the 5th ‘P’ in the social marketing mix (Weinreich 1999; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010; Donovan and Henley 2010; Weinreich 2011). This recognition is however juxtaposed by the reality that as social marketers continue to incorporate this additional ‘P’ as an essential element of most interventions (Niblett 2005; Temple, Long et al. 2008; Donovan and Henley 2010); social marketing partnerships remain an under researched (Lefebvre 2006; Raggio and Folse 2011) and underutilised area (Abercrombie, Sawatzki et al. 2012). The impact of partnership approaches therefore has limited capacity for behavioural change success until a framework is developed to ensure that practitioners understand how to engage appropriately with each other (Lefebvre 2009).

This chapter presents the rationale for theoretically underpinning social marketing partnerships through the articulation of an evolving social marketing domain. While for instance, Kotler and Zaltman (1971) assert boundaries and defines the discipline and Andresen (2003) broadly examine its history highlighting some of the apparent challenges facing social marketing; other authors have documented the key milestones that have occurred within this field (See for example Kotler and Zaltman 1971; Lefebvre and Flora 1988; Andreasen 2003; Kotler and Lee 2008; Kotler and Lee 2009; Dahl 2010). The discussion within this chapter is more confined. By specifically examining the implications of the transition within social marketing thought from a historically short term ‘transactional’ orientation to a longer term ‘transformational’ perspective a deepened comprehension of the importance of social marketing partnerships is achieved.

This chapter begins by discussing this paradigm shift within the discipline, followed by an outline of primary and secondary objectives of this research.
1.2 From Transactional to Relational Social Marketing Thought

Social marketing has gained global recognition as a behavioural change strategy (Laczniak, Lusch et al. 1979; Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Dahl 2010) which applies learning from commercial marketing theory (Hastings 2003; Peattie and Peattie 2003; Niblett 2005; Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006; Dahl 2010) as well as other implicated disciplines such as psychology, anthropology and sociology (Kotler and Zaltman 1971; McKenzie-Mohr 2000; Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006). Social marketing however is not a theory; it is a conceptual framework that when applied seeks to positively influence behaviours (Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006).

The usefulness of marketing communication strategies in the non business setting (Rothschild 1979) had been articulated as early as 1951 when Wiebe posed the question “…Can we sell brotherhood and rationale thinking like soap?” (Wiebe 1951 p.679). Wiebe (1951) suggested that traditional marketers were tasked with motivating citizens to engage in overt behaviours, usually product purchasing, and questioned why these techniques could not be translated into mobilising citizen responsibility and community participation. Upon deeper reflection, Rothschild (1979) suggests that the complexity of behavioural change characterised by the high level of involvement and heterogeneity of markets reinforces the difficulty of ‘selling’ behavioural change, particularly when reliant on marketing communications. At the same time marketing as a discipline was under increasing pressure to become “more socially relevant” (Andreasen 1994 p.109). Due to emerging marketing technologies, the opportunities to work with the non-profit sector increased, as did the relevance of its application to facilitate social change. This was counter intuitive to the perceived negative impact of commercial marketing at this time (Laczniak, Lusch et al. 1979; Andreasen 1994).

The scope and definition of social marketing continues to spark much debate in the world of academia (Andreasen 1994). Kolter and Zaltman first coined the term ‘Social Marketing’ (MacFadyen, Stead et al. 1999) in their seminal paper in 1971 defining it as:
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“The design, implementation and control of programmes calculated to influence the acceptability of social ideas and involving considerations of product planning, pricing, communication, distribution and market research.” (Kotler and Zaltman 1971 p. 5).

Kotler and Zaltman’s (1971) definition emphasised social marketing as a planned process; applying the techniques of their commercial counterparts to changing ‘social ideas’. It mirrored a management perspective focusing on the implementation of the ‘4 P’s’ of the conventional marketing mix namely; product, place, price and promotion. Although useful, Andreasen (1994) identified ambiguities with this definition which led to confusion, such as the perception that a change in attitude is correlated with a change in behaviour. As a result early social marketing strategies were dominated by creating awareness and educating the consumer in an attempt to facilitate behavioural change (Smith 2000). This portrayal resulted in the belief that the purpose of social marketing was to change the attitudes of the target group as opposed to their behaviour which actually lies at the core of the discipline (Andreasen 1994; Andreasen 2002; Andreasen 2003). Often these strategies failed to have the desired effect as the rewards for engaging in the behaviour benefited society as a whole in the long term as opposed to the individual in the short term (Rangan, Karim et al. 1996). These types of strategies are also based on individual deficit models of change whereby the individual is responsible for altering their own behaviour which makes it difficult to address problems at scale (Goldberg 1995; Lefebvre 2011). This micro marketing perspective on change is limiting as it is outcome versus process focused (Dholakia 1984).

The debate encompassing the scope and definition of social marketing continues (Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Domegan 2008) with over 45 peer reviewed definitions in existence (Dann 2010). The original individual ‘transactional’ 4P’s management perspective was considered too narrow to continue to tackle the types of issues arising in contemporary society (Andreasen 2006). To reflect this comprehension of how behaviours are constructed and to acknowledge the influence of broader determinants in shaping and influencing behaviours (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005; Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006) the researcher has adopted Andreasen’s (1995) definition:
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“The application of commercial marketing technologies to the analysis, planning, execution and evaluation of programmes designed to influence voluntary behaviour of target audiences in order to improve their personal welfare and that of society.” (Andreasen 1995 p. 7)

Gordon et al. (2006) argues that this definition effectively highlights the four key principles of social marketing: voluntary behavioural change, exchange, marketing techniques and end goals. This definition acknowledges the connection between the individual and society as co–influencers and alludes to a multifaceted approach to change. However, it is recognised that it is not a perfect definition, as the appropriateness of the inclusion of voluntary behavioural change is currently under scrutiny due to policy lead interventions such as law reforms which can deem some actions mandatory. In response social marketers are slowly moving away from using terminology such as behavioural change to all encompassing expressions such as social change, social improvement and social innovation which directs action towards the individual and society (Andreasen 1995; Donovan 2000; Hastings 2003; Peattie and Peattie 2003; Zainuddin, Russell-Bennett Rebekah et al. 2007; Douglas 2008; Domegan and Bringle 2010; Cairns, Mackay et al. 2011; Lefebvre 2011). From this perspective Lefebvre (2011) as well as others advocate a movement beyond the individual, framing issues within markets and societies; also encompassing networks and communities (Donovan 2000; Roberts 2000; Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000; Newton-Ward, Andreasen et al. 2004; Douglas 2008; Desai 2009; Lefebvre 2009; Lefebvre and Kotler 2011; Lefebvre 2011; Raggio and Folse 2011).

1.2.1 Problem Framing within Social Marketing

Social marketing is now accepted as an approach that seeks to tackle issues that impact on the wellbeing of society (Hastings 2003) through the application of marketing principles and exchange (Domegan 2008). As a result the breath and intricacy of issues facing social marketers have expanded to encompass a broader repertoire ranging from public health (Lefebvre and Flora 1988; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010; Abercrombie, Sawatzki et al. 2012) and community engagement (Bryant, McCormack Brown et al. 2007) to global warming (Geller 1989; McKenzie-Mohr
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2000) and disaster relief (Guion, Scammon et al. 2007; Raggio and Folse 2011) with social problems continuing to increase in complexity and longevity (Goldberg 1995; Domegan 2008; Desai 2009). As previously alluded to, traditionally interventions focused on a micro model approach, believing that citizens had the power to overcome negative behaviours; therefore neglecting to examine the impact of broader environmental forces (Andreasen 1997), the social contexts (Smith 2000) and other determinants (such as economics and sustainability) (Goldberg 1995) that shape human behaviour (Hastings and Donovan 2002; Peattie and Peattie 2003).

With this realisation also comes the acceptance that the types of problems social marketers are tasked with addressing have a profound impact on the framing of solutions. Roberts (2000) identifies three categories of problems which increase in degree of complexity. Type one is classified as a simple problem, whereby there is agreement as to the problems definition and solution, meaning there is little conflict and a high degree of consensus ensuring the problem can be solved relatively easily. Type two is defined as complex. Like Type one there is agreement as to what the problem is however, little consensus on how best to tackle it and therefore the level of conflict increases. Social marketer’s exposure to the third type of issue referred to as ‘wicked’ problems is becoming more frequent. In this scenario there is little consensus amongst stakeholders on the definition of the problem or the solution, therefore the number of stakeholders increases as does the potential for conflict (Bye 2000; Roberts 2000; Australian Public Service Commission 2007). Stakeholders in this context are individuals or organisations who have an interest in activities and the solution (Roberts 2000; French 2010). Using the issue of obesity as one example of a wicked problem, the generic map (Figure 1.1) as illustrated in the Foresight Report, reinforces this conundrum when developing behavioural change strategies.

This generic map (Figure 1.1) identifies multiple interrelated networks of effects that impact on obesity, and within each network a web of multiple factors that are also shown to be interconnected. Solutions are therefore propelled from a short term to a long term perspective. By understanding the interdependencies between the networks an understanding of hidden influencers can also become apparent (Moreira 2011). Contextualising the problem from this standpoint reinforces Lefebvre’s
(2011) argument to mobilise social change through markets and societies as opposed to isolated individual micro models of change that cannot be implemented at scale.

Figure 1.1 Generic Map of Influencers of Obesity

![Generic Map of Influencers of Obesity]

Source: (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007 p.82)

Goldberg (1995 p. 347) also called for “radical approaches in social marketing” to examine the social system in which behaviours are constructed. Utilising a less complex example to analyse the issues, Wallack, Dorfman et al.’s (1993) analogy of individuals drowning in a river illustrates the depth and complexity of problem solving within social marketing (Wallack, Dorfman et al. 1993; Goldberg 1995). This anecdote depicts multiple layers of influence impacting on the individual’s behaviours or decision making processes, referred to as down, mid and upstream (Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006; Stead, Gordon et al. 2007).
At the downstream level, individuals were chastised for choosing to jump in the river. However, the further upstream you travel searching for the source of the problem the more pronounced the environmental factors contributing to individual choices. For example, advertising and policy decisions, such as planning, can result in diminished blame on the individual (Wymer 2011). Through a deeper analysis of the contributing factors on behavioural choices the potential for alternative strategies manifests.

The micro (downstream) and macro (upstream) levels referred to by Wallack, Dorfman et al. (1993) can be differentiated through their approach to change. At the macro level change agents are tasked with catalysing a movement within the wider social context, removing the environmental barriers that impact on choices made (Gillies 1998). This movement is feasible as Hastings (2003 p.5) identifies behaviours as “socially as well as individually determined”. This perspective reframes social marketing strategies from a transactional or service orientation dominated by short term interventions implementing the 4 P’s; to transformational based approaches which facilitate the implementation of change strategies at different levels (up, mid or downstream) simultaneously over the long term. The synergising of this service and/or systems thinking is referred to as a Total Market Approach (TMA) to change (French 2010; Lefebvre 2011).

1.2.2 Comprehending a Total Market Approach to Change

From a TMA approach drivers of social change are interpreted to be multi–dimensional with multi-stakeholders incorporating three levels of interventions (Hastings and Donovan 2002). These dimensions are outlined below.

1. Individual, micro or downstream approaches:

Change is focused on the individual, to raise their confidence and skills (Hastings and Donovan 2002) and to empower them to make positive changes to their lifestyles. The disadvantage of adopting this single approach is the risk of blaming the consumer for their behaviours without examining the impact of external factors; therefore key triggers remain the same (Hoek 2011). This ‘transactional’ perspective
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communicates directly with the individual through awareness and information, with the aim of facilitating behavioural change (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). At this downstream level interventions are always competing against choice and the vast array of negative behaviours that are available to the audience (Andreasen 1995). These types of short term social marketing programmes practiced in isolation cannot be expected to result in long term sustainable behavioural changes (Lefebvre and Flora 1988).

In an effort to compete in the present complex environment a ‘systems’ perspective has developed to complement downstream activities (Wymer 2010). Voluntary behavioural change remains the central ethos in this ‘systems’ perspective utilising a network of relationships for goal convergence (Domegan 2008).

2. Community or midstream approaches:

Community level strategies build supportive environments by facilitating community ownership, participation and control (Middlestadt, Schechter et al. 1997; McKenzie-Mohr 2000). By partnering with individuals within the community social change can be accomplished as specific segments of the population are targeted, for example, communities, clubs, and associations (Bryant, McCormack Brown et al. 2007).

3. Macro or upstream approaches:

This strategy targets influencers such as legislators and regulators, government, policy makers, and the media as a target audience in their own right as part of a single intervention. These individuals are at the society or upstream level where policy changes occur (Andreasen 2006). Upstream strategies are defined as; “altering the institutions that form the social system within which the individual operates”(Goldberg 1995 p.365).

This upstream definition also identifies the action that needs to be undertaken to bring about change; however, it does not emphasise the processes or techniques needed as a catalyst. Upstream participants are tasked with higher impact approaches acting as advocates for a systems level change restructuring through
engagement in activities that can lead to sustainable environmental change (Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008). This level is non–static and constantly changing making transformation more difficult and proponents may receive criticism for ‘policing’ behaviours (Hoek 2011). The discussion of upstream strategies within social marketing literature is disproportionate to that of its downstream counterpart (Wymer 2011).

TMA agendas differ from upstream interventions in that they are issue driven, with a heavy advocacy and service call, the aim being to mobilise the system (community, society or global) with policy change outcomes removing environmental barriers (Previte and Fry 2006).

Hoek (2011) advocates an integrated approach to behavioural change through population and individual lead interventions. The dynamics of this perspective of change is presented in Figure 1.2 whereby down and up stream social marketing strategies are incorporated on a continuum as opposed to as separate strategies. This continuum embodies the rejection of a question posed by many social marketers when faced with complex issues such as smoking cessation; “Do we focus on the individual or the environment surrounding the individual?” (Smith 1998 p.13). This quandary could undermine the development of the discipline in the future (Smith 2000). By diffusing this false dichotomy of logic models (Goldberg 1995), Figure 1.2 also identifies that behavioural change strategies can be displaced along the continuum depending on the needs impacting on the issue. Goldberg (1995) suggests that commercial marketers have been encouraged to ‘iterate’ between macro and micro domains in their endeavours, therefore highlighting the potential interactive, complementary opportunities between down and upstream activities.

This perspective reinforces Lefebvre’s (2011) suggestion that to overcome the individual focused approach issues should be reframed as contexts or markets investigating social conditioning in a competitive environment. With this stance Lefebvre (2011 p.66) envisions that:

“Social marketing may offer many different stakeholders a methodology to systematically develop dissemination efforts of all kinds.”
This transformational perspective of change introduces the opportunity for many stakeholders to synergise through multidisciplinary action across levels (up, mid and downstream) for resource allocation to facilitate desired social goals (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005; Andreasen 2006; Previte and Fry 2006; Domegan 2008; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010; Hoek 2011; Marques and Domegan 2011). This necessity for a movement between and across all levels occurs as no individual or agency can solve the complex problems that are developing in society (Lefebvre 2009; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010). This movement can be captured through a vertical and horizontal perspective on change as illustrated in Figure 1.3.

French (2010) describes the characteristics of the type of horizontal and vertical approach illustrated in Figure 1.3:

- A vertical (up, mid and/or downstream) perspective examines the social determinants of behaviours. This examination generates an understanding of
where the determinants materialise, on what agenda and the actions that should be taken to facilitate change across all levels.

- A horizontal perspective identifies the influencers and the actions that need to be taken within each level to drive change. These are the areas that need to act to ensure that this TMA materialises.

Figure 1.3 A Total Market Approach to Change

Bringing about vertical (up, mid and downstream) and horizontal (within levels) change is also driven by the fact that behaviours are influenced by multiple uncontrollable factors (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005) and the constant challenge to maintain behavioural changes (Andreasen 2006; Zainuddin, Russell-Bennett et al. 2008); often utilising limited resources (Lefebvre and Flora 1988). This realisation has called for collaborative strategies to be adopted within problem solving whereby multiple stakeholders work together to facilitate change (Roberts 2000; Manandhar, Maimbolwa et al. 2008).
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1.3 Implications for the Development of Social Marketing Partnerships

A TMA encompasses what has been described as social and economic long term change which can only be achieved by working in partnerships (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005; Domegan 2008) coordinating efforts to increase success (Andreasen 1995; Lefebvre 2009). This perspective catalyses change through simultaneous synergies in approach at every level (Domegan 2008) as opposed to competing against each other for finite resources (Lefebvre 2006). This transformational approach recognises that the issues social marketers seek to resolve are high involvement with limited instant gratification for adoption of altered behaviours (McDermott, Stead et al. 2005; Smith 2006; Lefebvre 2011). These fundamental characteristics predetermine that overall sustainable change will not occur overnight.

Similarly to French (2010), Lefebvre (2011) suggests a TMA believing that the collaborative and collective synthesis can assist in the development of cohesive relationships between public, Non–Governmental Organisations (NGO) and the private sector. Total market or strategic approaches incorporate many stakeholders working simultaneously in multi-intervention activities in various sectors and settings (Story, Nanney et al. 2009; Domegan and Bringle 2010) moving from interaction to relational exchange (Hastings and Saren 2003). Relationship marketing is considered a relevant theory to understand this type of exchange and has been advocated by the foremost social marketing experts in the world (Hastings 2003; Peattie and Peattie 2003; Hastings 2007; Wood 2008; Desai 2009); however it has yet to fully translate to the social marketing domain (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000; Hastings 2003; Hastings and Saren 2003; Marques and Domegan 2011).

One type of relational exchange is partnerships and it has been argued that the type of social change described in this chapter cannot be facilitated without the adoption of partnership approaches (Roberts 2000; Andreasen 2006; Domegan 2008; Abercrombie, Sawatzki et al. 2012). Reflecting on this panoramic systems based orientation, social marketing partnerships have evolved beyond passive secure funding agreements, to sustained and interactive strategic collaborations to achieve lasting impact (French 2010). To mobilise this transformational perspective, a networked approach is recommended to build upon capacity (Cheng, Kotler et al. 2012).
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2010; French 2010), leveraging resources and reach to develop a TMA to change (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). This perspective is differentiated from the movement in the 1990’s to adopt partnerships to operationalise an intervention at a downstream level, specifically targeting the individual (Andreasen 1995).

Partnerships have been heralded as an essential ingredient for success for social marketing interventions (Samuels 1993; Andreasen 1995; Niblett 2005). This type of collaborative partnership approach has become increasingly popular with both non-government and governmental agencies alike to address common behavioural change objectives to tackle complex issues, for example, obesity (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005); heart disease (Temple, Long et al. 2008) and global warming (McKenzie-Mohr 2000). However, partnership development in social marketing is a difficult activity (Sowers 2005) and while practiced, it is a poorly researched approach (Andreasen 1995; Lefebvre 2006). Lefebvre (2006) argues that critical areas, such as the role and development of partnerships, communication across and between levels including staffing and branding issues, would benefit from greater guidance.

Reflecting on the scarcity of empirical research on the role and definition of social marketing partnerships and a greater evidence base of practical application (Sowers 2005); social marketing partnerships remain ambiguous with no explicit definition for guidance. Within the social marketing literature there is no conceptual framework or model to capture partnerships across and within different change levels, incorporating transactional or transformational-based partnerships. Instead, a trend has emerged whereby practitioners are opting to create guidelines based on past experiences with operational partnerships (Weinreich 1999; Weinreich 2011). This has fuelled a call for a partnership template, especially from those social marketing partnerships working across and between sectors (Lefebvre and Flora 1988).

Framing issues from a holistic, total market or systems based mind-set equates to an active engagement process catalysing the co-creation of value through mutual exchanges of parties (Previte and Fry 2006). For value to be co-created, social marketers must provide the target audience with something of mutual benefit, meaning the reward for behavioural change outweighs the costs (Hastings 2003).
Previte and Fry (2006) advocate that relational thinking is an inherent aspect of this ideal; with some arguing that it underpins this new perspective of change within social marketing (Hastings and Saren 2003; Hastings 2007; Marques and Domegan 2011). Currently further development of this conceptualisation is being inhibited by a lack of comprehension on how to implement this integrated approach (Smith 1998; Wymer 2011). This shift in mind-set has amplified the need to revisit the role and function of partnerships from a systems perspective (Donovan 2000).

1.3.1 Developing a Social Marketing Partnership Model

As the issues social marketers attempt to address continually grow in complexity, there is a call for the adoption of multifaceted strategies to address the aggregation of direct and indirect stakeholders impacting on behaviour (Previte and Fry 2006). In parallel to this progressive network of influences on behaviour, the usefulness of a partnership approach to behavioural change has been highlighted. Relationship marketing has been advocated as an appropriate theory to guide the continued development of a partnership orientation (Hastings 2003; Peattie and Peattie 2003; Hastings 2007; Wood 2008).

Social marketing could benefit from the adoption of a rational perspective of exchange, progressively moving beyond isolated transactions and adopting a more consumer orientated and network focused approach. Since social marketing is customer orientated and insight driven, co-creation of value is a central ethos in the discipline (Desai 2009) as is voluntary behavioural change which “implicitly and explicitly embrace relationships” (Domegan 2008 p. 137).

At present, social marketers who maintain a transaction based perspective (i.e. focus solely on downstream efforts) find that value creation is inhibited as the rewards or mutual benefits for exchanging one behaviour for another may not be immediately or directly reciprocated (Lefebvre and Flora 1988; McDermott, Stead et al. 2005). Coupled with the fact that social marketers are tasked with competing against direct and indirect factors with target audiences who may be unaware that they have a problem (Smith 2006) have increased the need for a transformational approach. From this perspective, it has been repeatedly proposed that a relationship orientated
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approach should be translated into every aspect of social marketing (Lee 2007) as it has the potential to serve as a basis for knowledge generation for vertical and horizontal partnerships (Hastings 2003). Despite this strong argument for applying relationship marketing knowledge to social marketing partnerships and it’s apparent fit (Desai 2009) this idea remains rudimentary in nature and has not been expanded or empirically tested.

Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) theory of relational exchange is one of the best known and most cited theories in the relationship marketing literature when discussing marketing relationships (Morris and Carter 2005). Given the current status of social marketing partnerships Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model can be used to address this apparent deficit in understanding ‘transactional’ and ‘transformational’ social marketing partnerships. This theory proposes that relationship commitment and trust are central to successful long term relational development acting as a precursor for cooperative behaviours (Morgan and Hunt 1994; Gronroos 1997). Social marketers also position commitment and trust at the centre of their activities (Hastings 2003; Hastings and Saren 2003; Hastings 2007; Lefebvre 2011; Marques and Domegan 2011).

Morgan and Hunt’s model (Figure 1.4) also identifies Key Mediating Variables (KMV) of relational exchange, conceptualised as either antecedents or consequences, which positively and negatively impact on relationship commitment and trust and therefore partnership development. Morgan and Hunt (1994) empirically tested their model in a single automobile industry in the context of one focal firm and their interactions with what they referred to as buyer, internal, supplier and lateral partners. To increase the rigour of this model, Morgan and Hunt (1994) called for it to be tested in a variety of industries. This call has resulted in its extension or adaptation in a multitude of settings particularly those addressing similar buyer seller relationships in the commercial setting. Examples of scenarios tested include supplier logistical performance (Morris and Carter 2005); primary care physicians (Leisen and Hyman 2004); hotel and catering (Bowen and Shoemaker 1998); buyer and a business to business e–marketplace (Lancastre and Lages 2006); service firms (Friman, Gärling et al. 2002). The preceding examples confirm that the majority of empirical research refer to and extend Morgan and Hunts (1994)
Chapter One: Introduction

theory of relational exchange within a business-to-business context. One exception to this application is the extension of this theory into the non-profit sector by MacMillan, Money et al. (2005). This empirical investigation examined funder relationships and focused on the antecedents of commitment and trust. There is no evidence that MacMillan, Money et al.’s (2005) model has been empirically tested in the social marketing domain where the primary motivation for engaging in relational exchange is non-monetary.

Figure 1.4 Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable Model

Source: (Morgan and Hunt 1994 p.22)
1.4 Objectives of this Study

1.4.1 Primary Research Objective

The primary objective of this research is to develop a social marketing partnership framework through the extension of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model (Figure 1.4) within the social marketing domain.

1.4.2 Secondary Research Objectives

To extend this model into the social marketing domain a conceptualisation of the social marketing partnership entity is needed. Therefore to support this primary objective, five secondary objectives have been devised, as outlined below:

Secondary Objective 1: To identify the key milestones pertaining to the evolution of social marketing partnership development including the implications this change has on:

- The roles undertaken by participants.
- The selection and interaction processes related to social marketing partnership formation.
- The types of partnership engagement.

Secondary Objective 2: To analyse the boundaries of social marketing partnerships through an examination of the different definitions adopted by practitioners and academics.

Secondary Objective 3: To delineate the different social marketing partnership taxonomies.

Secondary Objective 4: To determine the key antecedent variables impacting on social marketing partnerships.

Secondary Objective 5: To establish the key outcome variables of social marketing partnerships.
These research objectives will be achieved through a three phased methodological approach which includes a literature review, case study analysis and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM).

1.5 Contribution to Social Marketing Knowledge

The key findings of this research contribute to the continued development of social marketing knowledge in four key areas, including theoretical, methodological, managerial and policy development.

1.5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This research extends Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) (see Figure 1.4) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model of relationships into the social marketing domain. The literature suggests that relationship marketing is considered a relevant theory for understanding the complex exchanges apparent when addressing wicked type problems evident in today’s society; however it has yet to fully translate into the social marketing domain. By extending one of the best known and most cited models within the relationship marketing literature (Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) KMV model) into the social marketing domain; this research further infuses the relational marketing paradigm with social marketing. Recently published texts, such as the Handbook of Social Marketing (Sage 2012) have discussed this paradigm shift however, at this time have not addressed the potential of social marketing within the partnership context.

By empirically testing the social marketing partnership framework (see Figure 1.5), the researcher confirmed that the phenomena under investigation did exist meaning the constructs had explanatory power. This ability to explain social marketing partnerships systematically contributes to the conceptualisation of the entity; explanation is a prerequisite of prediction in theory development. It is this predictive property which offers the social marketers implementing partnerships the ability to control the partnership process and also the consequences of such engagement.
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Social marketing partnerships have, in the past, been criticised for their conceptual and definitional ambiguity. Through the methodological approach adopted within this research, this investigation contributed to defining the boundaries of social marketing partnerships in two ways. Firstly, in the absence of a consensus related to an explicit definition of social marketing partnerships; by analysing the definitions that do exist, a comprehension of the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships manifested. As no conceptual definition is currently in existence, the presence of these key characteristics can assist in differentiating what is and what is not a social marketing partnership. These characteristics also formed the basis for the research propositions that guided phase two of this research, the Get Your Life in Gear (GYLG) case study analysis.

Secondly, through the case study analysis, the key social marketing characteristics were confirmed to exist and as a result operationalised within the social marketing partnership context. Without the singular definition for each construct arising in this research they could not be scientifically tested and the research hypothesis required during the model testing could not have been developed.

Figure 1.5 The Key Mediating Variable Framework of Social Marketing Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Ten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MB = Mutual Benefits  
SV = Shared Values  
Com = Communication  
RC = Relationship Commitment  
Tr = Trust  
Mot = Expectation of Continuance  
Coop = Cooperation  
Ten = Tension
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Along with positioning relationship commitment and trust as central to social marketing partnerships this research identified three antecedents and three outcomes of social marketing partnerships (See Figure 1.5). As a result of this research the importance of three of these constructs within the partnership process was intensified, including shared values, cooperation and communication of expectations.

1.5.2 Methodological Contributions

Within this research both formative and reflective item scales were used to empirically test the proposed social marketing partnership model. By explicitly operationalising the key social marketing partnership constructs within this research, the reflective item scales that were previously validated within the marketing domain were transferred and deemed applicable. None of these scales had previously been utilised as measures of constructs within the social marketing context. The formative measures used within the tension and cooperation item scales were specifically developed to measure these two constructs within the social marketing partnership context.

Through the periodisation of the evolution of social marketing partnership thought, the periodic shifts in partnership strategies were identified from the 1970s until the present time. This allowed for the examination of the distinctive types of partnerships evident within the social marketing domain and the implications they have for theory development.

1.5.3 Managerial Contributions

Transformational approaches to social changes call for long term sustainable multi-sectoral partnerships. From a management perspective, this assertion alludes to the appropriate selection, maintenance and evaluation of the partnership whilst also broadening the potential pool of partners and stakeholders from those directly related to the issue to those directly and indirectly associated. By comprehending the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships this research contributes to an awareness of the skills required to effectively manage them. This social marketing partnership framework calls for managers to be knowledgeable of the tools and
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techniques needed to maintain good relationships such as communication, dialogue and networking. These types of characteristics also introduce the need for interdisciplinary teams which may have competing ideologies. If implemented correctly using this framework, social marketing partnerships can facilitate innovative solutions if common goals are effectively communicated, however, if managed ineffectively can lead to difficult working relationships.

Managers must also be skilled in selecting partners that strategically fit the organisation and also the issue. This research also contributed to the manager’s ability to differentiation between partnership and stakeholder during this selection process. Stakeholders were identified to be passive participators in supporting endeavours as opposed to partnerships who mobilise change. Although managers must priorities the partnerships they engage with, they must not underestimate the power and influence that their network of stakeholders also exert.

1.5.4 Policy Contributions

Due to the multifaceted nature of the issues evident in society, policy makers must adopt a mutlisectoral perspective to change endeavours incorporating a transformational approach working in synergy with multiple disciplinary groups. This moves policy development away from historically hierarchical approaches towards an integrated system perspective which introducing innovative options and solutions. This research contributes to a deepened understanding of how to co-build structures and institutional rules, enabling access, engaging people and exemplifying desired changes. This type of systemic change calls for a long term visionary approach working across departmental, organisational and sector boundaries and therefore is enhanced through the existence of a partnership framework.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of Study

There are a number of limitations to this study that are acknowledged from the outset and described below.
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A conscious decision was made to contain the literature reviewed within the social marketing domain. It is conceded that partnership development has been investigated with other disciplines across the social sciences such as community development, psychology and health promotion. However, despite the social marketing discipline being over half a century old no such model has been empirically tested within the social marketing domain. There has been no holistic analysis of the characteristics of partnerships within social marketing therefore it is important to assess the disciplines current position before looking further for guidance. It is argued that to fully comprehend social marketing partnerships, how it is currently conceptualised and practically applied, an understanding of how it is perceived in the social marketing context is necessary.

Public-private partnerships are recognised as a growing area within the social marketing partnership literature and as a type of relationship that can be mobilised to form a partnership. However, the specific characteristics that impact of this type of relationship are not a fundamental element of this research, neither is the role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). These topics have the potential to be more extensively investigated as part of further research.

This research adopted a cross sectional design to test the social marketing partnership model. The causal inferences discussed within this research could benefit if it were to be measured over time and extended into longitudinal research.

The methodology includes a single case study, which is used to operationalise the definitions of key social marketing constructs. Although where necessary it is desirable to undertake a multiple case study strategy; this case is deemed adequate due to its longitudinal characteristic and it is combined with further empirical testing. Single case studies are also appropriate when analysing new phenomena.

Finally, the purpose of the research is to test the theoretical model and not to generalise the findings to the social marketing population.
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1.7 Research Methodology

To address these primary and secondary objectives three-phased methodology was adopted as summarised in Figure 1.6.

Through a periodisation of social marketing partnership developments within phase one of the research methodology three eras of partnership development are identified. These eras include a Period of Cooperation (1970 – 1980s), Period of Formalisation (1980s – Mid 1990s) and Period of Integrated Systems (Mid 1990’s – Present). Within these eras, the difficulties attributed to defining the entity of social marketing partnerships becomes apparent, due to the vast array of terms used to denote this type of relationship. To assist in delineating social marketing partnerships, four social marketing partnership taxonomies are evaluated to assist in defining the key mediating variables of social marketing partnerships.

Figure 1.6 Summary of Research Methodology

- **Phase 1 - Literature Review**
  - Periodisation of SM Partnerships: 3 eras Period of Coordination, Formalisation & Integration
  - Delineation of SM Partnerships
  - SM Partnership Taxonomies
  - Key Antecedents & Outcomes of SM Partnerships

- **Phase 2 - Case Study**
  - Realism as the Theoretical Framework
  - Explanatory Case Study Justification
  - Case Study Background & Introduction to GYLG Pilot Initiative
  - Data Collection Instruments, Protocols & Method
  - Case Study Analytical Framework
  - Validity & Reliability

- **Phase 3 - Structural Equation Modelling**
  - Research Hypotheses
  - SEM Theory & Implementation
  - Data Collection Method
  - Data Collection Instrument
  - Sampling
  - Fieldwork
  - SEM Data Analysis
Phase two focuses on strengthening the conceptual argument for the proposed social marketing partnership model (Sutton and Staw 1995). Theory building within this research is thereby assisted through a case study analysis (Perry 1998) as opposed to verification (Bonoma 1985). The case studies methodology permits the examination of phenomena in a real world setting or context by observing relationships; in turn deepening the understanding of the chosen topic (Platt 2006). The GYLG case study analysis conducted within this research consists of two and a half years of collated data from three main sources of evidence including minutes from meetings, field researcher notes/diary and letter/email and telephone correspondence between initiative partners. This case has two objectives it establishes the empirical referents necessary for hypothesis building acting as a pre-test for the key social marketing partnership constructs (Platt 2006). Secondly, it outlines the rules of interpretation for the stated research hypothesis (Hunt 2010a). The processes undertaken to fulfill these objectives are outlined in detail within Chapter Three.

To confirm the validity of the proposed social marketing partnership model, Structural Equation Modelling is used to test the internal logic within the third-phase of this research (Hunt 2010b). An online survey was used as the data collection method. A two tiered sampling strategy was employed; the online survey was primarily distributed to experts in the area of social marketing partnerships primarily in the United Kingdom (UK) and the island of Ireland (IOI), secondarily to the global social marketing community. Structural Equation Modelling was utilised to analyse the data. This confirmatory approach allows for the modelling of ‘complex interdependencies’ and increases the researcher’s control of measurement error (Healy and Perry 2000; Hunt 2010c).

1.8 Overview of Thesis Content

An overview of the content of this entire thesis is presented in Figure 1.7. As previously described, Chapter Two the literature review is the first phase in the methodology for this research. Within this chapter, the existing social marketing partnership literature was analysed resulting in the identification of the key social marketing partnership mediating variables. Research propositions were also developed to guide the next phase of the research.
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**Figure 1.7 Thesis Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>From transactional to relational SM thought</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the development of SM partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives of this study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected contribution to marketing knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope and limitations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>Evolution of Social Marketing Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodisation of SM Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delineation of SM partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SM partnership taxonomies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key antecedents &amp; outcomes of SM Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Case Study Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realism as the theoretical framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory case study analysis justification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case study background and introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection instrument, protocols &amp; method</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case study analytical framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Case Study Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delineation of SM partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Chapter Three describes the procedures undertaken within phase two, the case study research methodology. This case study permits the examination of phenomena in a real world setting by observing relationships; in turn deepening the understanding of social marketing partnerships (Platt 2006).

Chapter Four presents the findings and analysis from the Get Your Life into Gear (GYLG) pilot social marketing initiative. As an outcome of this analysis the key mediating variables of the social marketing partnerships were defined and empirically testable research hypothesis were developed.

Chapter Five describes the procedures for testing the proposed social marketing model using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM).

Within Chapter Six the key findings from the exploratory factor analysis and SEM are discussed.

Chapter Seven concludes with a discussion of the conclusion, implications and recommendations arising from this research.

The next chapter discusses the evolution of social marketing partnerships as presented within the social marketing literature.
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2.1 Introduction

Social marketing partnerships have been advocated as a necessary component of social change strategies (Andreasen 2006; Abercrombie, Sawatzki et al. 2012) whilst also emerging as an essential element of most interventions (Niblett 2005; Temple, Long et al. 2008). As social marketing partnerships are accepted as the 5th ‘P’ in the social marketing mix (Weinreich 1999; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010; Donovan and Henley 2010; Weinreich 2011), it is argued that partnership approaches have become more important to social marketers than their commercial counterparts due to a lack of resources and infrastructure to assist in change endeavours (Temple, Long et al. 2008). To capitalise on the popularity and benefits of social marketing partnerships further research is needed into the characteristics that make social marketing partnerships effective (Lefebvre 2009; Raggio and Folse 2011).

In response, the aim of this chapter is to identify the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships. By comprehending how social marketing partnerships have evolved over the past 40 years an understanding of the underlying characteristics of partnerships is achieved. Social marketing partnerships have also been criticised for lacking clarity, hence by identifying the key social marketing characteristics that are evident within the literature, the boundaries of the entity can be clarified. These characteristics will arise from the periodisation of the social marketing partnership literature, an examination of the definitions and terms of reference of social marketing partnerships and the available taxonomies which have been used to guide their implementation.

A full outline of the themes discussed within this chapter is presented in Figure 2.1.

This chapter commences with the periodisation of social marketing partnership development.
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2.2 A Periodisation of Social Marketing Partnerships

Prior to the development of a proposed social marketing partnership framework and a discussion of the definition of this multifarious entity, a comprehension of the advancement of social marketing partnerships as a strategy will assist in articulating its complexity. Similar to the maturation of marketing thought as documented by Wilke and Moore (2003); the social marketing partnership literature cannot be examined as one unified entity (Wilkie and Moore 2003) as there is a clear shift in the dominant modes of partnership thinking between the 1970s and the present time. Therefore to assist in the conceptualisation of social marketing partnership thought three distinct eras are articulated; referred to within as a Period of Cooperation (1970 – 1990), Period of Formalisation (1990’s – 2000) and most recently Period of...

2.3 Current Definitions of Social Marketing Partnerships

• A formalised approach to definitions

2.4 Social Marketing Partnership Taxonomies

• A typology of non–profit competition
• Goal Convergence, trust and contacts in social marketing partnerships
• Partnership continuum
• A multi–relationship model of social marketing

2.5 KMV of Social Marketing Partnerships Summarised

• Relationship commitment
• Trust
• Mutual Benefit
• Shared Values
• Communication
• Tension
• Cooperation
• Motivation

2.6 Summary

• Research propositions
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*Integrated Systems (2000 – present).* The first era constitutes the earliest published material documenting social marketing partnership implementation referred to within as the *Period of Cooperation.*

### 2.2.1 Period of Cooperation 1970 – 1990’s

During the formative years of the discipline, as suggested in Chapter One social marketing was characterised as a technique used to market or disseminate social ideas to the individual (Kotler and Zaltman 1971; Laczniak, Lusch *et al.* 1979). By accepting Kotler and Zaltman’s (1971) definition of social marketing (as highlighted in Chapter One) practitioners adopted a micro management orientation broadly characterised by the implementation of the 4 P’s of the Marketing Mix (Product, Place, Price, Promotion). From this perspective, interventions focused on transactional approaches to exchange through the provision of products, services and advertising (Laczniak, Lusch *et al.* 1979; Sirgy, Morris *et al.* 1985; Andreasen 2001; Newton-Ward, Andreasen *et al.* 2004); alterations to structural variables were not included in change programmes (Dholakia 1984). This orientation had a direct influence on how partnerships manifested and the role they fulfilled during the implementation of programmes.

#### 2.2.1.1 Role of Cooperation within Social Marketing Activities

The inaugural example of what contemporary social marketers refer to as partnership approaches is difficult to determine as it was not a term referenced in this body of literature. However, evidence exists of the adoption of partnership centred strategies within the public health arena prior to the coining of the term social marketing in 1971. A family planning intervention developed in India in the 1960’s has been cited as one of the earliest examples of a social marketing programme (Dholakia 1984; Andreasen 2003; Lefebvre 2011). This exemplar alludes to how cooperation can lead to successful campaigns. For instance, as part of an overarching downstream strategy in India pharmacies were utilised as:

1. An existing distribution network for contraceptive products
2. Access points for the target citizen to create awareness about the use of contraception (Lefebvre 2011).
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This strategy symbolised the need for social marketers to be assisted through the integration of change activities within existing infrastructures to exert influence. From a management perspective, the place element of the marketing mix maximised change through actors that could broadly assist in the implementation of the programmes and communicate to the target market (Geller 1989). This trend continued over the next twenty years.

Familiar terms such as partnerships or relationships are not evident within this early literature, instead references were made to cooperation and coordination of efforts (El-Ansary and Kramer Jr 1973). These referents accredit key funders or supporters of social causes working together on short term interventions to facilitate individual orientated behavioural change with little rubric or explanation. When discussing a family planning programme, El–Ansary and Kramer Jr (1973) evaluate social marketing success in terms of established benchmarks in the traditional marketing sense (i.e. the implementation of the marketing mix). As a result, marketing was interpreted as a social process involving many participants bound through the integration of the marketing mix therefore increasing the impact of their efforts. During this era the focus of social marketing remained on the customer; however, the role of interpersonal networks began to protrude as strategies were broadened beyond the individual, to include other actors who could positively influence the behaviour of the primary audience (El-Ansary and Kramer Jr 1973).

In their review of the first 10 years of Social Marketing, Fox and Kotler (1980) also evaluated activities through the coordination of the four P’s of the marketing mix. By interpreting the text, benefits of such approaches resulted in strengthened campaigns through improving operations or the distribution of messaging whilst building on capacity beyond social advertising (Fox and Kotler 1980). Similar to El–Ansary and Kramer Jr (1973), Fox and Kotler (1980) make references to two or more parties working together, citing terms such as cooperation, interdisciplinary interventions and networks of agents, however this discussion lacks detail. Within both texts, government agencies and/or non government organisations (NGOs), for example charities, dominated as the main cooperators of interventions focusing on lifestyle related issues, for example family planning, as well as heart disease (Fox and Kotler 1980). These types of organisations were depicted as the primary
instigators and funders who planned activities. These sort of social agencies often lacked resources (Bloom and Novelli 1981) therefore other actors were tasked with facilitating the distribution of the messages often referred to as intermediaries. The characteristics of these intermediaries are important as they were the organisations who often made the implementation of campaigns possible (Lefebvre and Flora 1988).

2.2.1.2 Intermediaries

During this epoch there was a proliferation in the utilisation of intermediaries who assisted in the implementation of interventions at a downstream level. The term collectively referred to those who could actively support campaigns such as doctors, community workers and the media acting as gatekeepers or distributors for behavioural change communications, products and services (Bloom and Novelli 1981; Dholakia 1984; Lefebvre and Flora 1988; Murray and Douglas 1988). Intermediaries were characterised as individuals and/or organisations who had access to target citizens; could most efficiently disseminate the message in a credible manner and who’s avenues of communication could improve reach (Bloom and Novelli 1981; Lefebvre and Flora 1988). Therefore, intermediaries were usually chosen for their pre–established network or channel of distribution which could be optimised to facilitate change, based on the specific needs of the target grouping (Bloom and Novelli 1981; Lefebvre and Flora 1988 and Lefebvre, Lasater et al. 1987). The usage of existing intermediaries was therefore desirable as they would be very expensive to establish (Bloom and Novelli 1981).

The level of input by intermediaries within the planning stages of interventions is unclear. Social marketers were tasked with motivating intermediaries to coordinate activities and where necessary training them to deliver high quality programmes (Bloom and Novelli 1981; Dholakia 1984). However, there is evidence of a lack of coordination between organisations within interventions (Lefebvre and Flora 1988). Although the infrastructure for message delivery seemed to be pre-established during this era social marketers found it difficult to persuade intermediaries to cooperate citing problems relating to establishing, utilising and controlling these influencers (Fox and Kotler 1980; Bloom and Novelli 1981). There was also a concern that as
the number of intermediaries increased the campaign message could suffer from dilution (Lefebvre and Flora 1988).

### 2.1.2.3 Responding to More Complex Issues

Towards the end of the 1980’s the necessity of multidimensional change programmes became more pronounced as the role of social or interpersonal networks as influencers became more dominant (Bloom and Novelli 1981; Lefebvre and Flora 1988; Murray and Douglas 1988). Previous campaigns were hampered by a difficulty in identifying determinants or influencers of behaviours, which in turn effected the impact of campaigns, for example, the role of policy makers and church communities (Fox and Kotler 1980; Bloom and Novelli 1981). Social marketers began to realise the limitations of behavioural change strategies that focused solely on the individual at the downstream level, resulting in the emergence of references to social change (Lefebvre, Lasater et al. 1987; Lefebvre and Flora 1988). This change in perspective marked the beginning of the transition from the short term implementation of interventions towards longer term sustainability of change which called for community mobilisation (Lefebvre, Lasater et al. 1987; Lefebvre and Flora 1988). However this was only advocated by a few as social marketing was still developing as a discipline.

Social marketers also began to recognise the role of policy when addressing complex issues such as alcohol consumption, which again amplified the necessity of engaging multiple audiences (Murray and Douglas 1988). In doing so, the concept of the target audience was broadened beyond the individual, the more traditional target for interventions to society’s influencers (Duhaime, McTavish et al. 1985; Lefebvre, Lasater et al. 1987; Murray and Douglas 1988).

Reflecting on Murray and Douglas (1988) perspective, deficiencies associated with this one-dimensional approach when used in isolation were evident during this era. An example cited by Fox and Kolter (1980) relating to population control, described a programme utilising mass media messaging and facilitating easier access to contraceptives failing due to strong cultural values and previously established political policy were widely ignored. Also, whilst discussing development within
third world countries, Duhaime, Mc Tavish et al. (1985) exhibit an advanced comprehension of the difficulties of facilitating social change during an era dominated by downstream interventions. They articulate that through the oversimplification of a complex issue such as family planning, the intervention failed to examine the process of change within the structure of society, which calls for a multifaceted approach. This includes the examination of structural and cultural influences (Duhaime, McTavish et al. 1985).

El–Ansary and Kramer Jr (1973) and Fox and Kotler’s (1980) references to coordination and similar terms mark the necessity of partnerships within interventions at this early stage. However, the discussion of their purpose is limited to one to two lines within the text. The role of partnerships as contemporary social marketers interpret in these papers is construed as secondary, instead included as a descriptor of the implementation of the social marketing process and application of the intervention, which is described in detail.

2.2.2 Period of Formalisation 1990’s – 2000’s

The influential role of the social environment in shaping behaviours became more pronounced in the 1990s, which in turn catalysed a formalised approach to partnership development. The period 1990–2000 identifies a shift in emphasis from isolated downstream interventions (of the period of cooperation) to the role of upstream actors who influenced environments and therefore shaped social marketing partnership formations.

2.2.2.1 Problem Formation

From the 1990s onwards, the term partnerships was becoming readily utilised along with references such as collaboration. References to this term insinuated that partnership development was becoming more strategic in nature. Commenting on the social marketing LEAN project (Low-Fat Eating for America Now) Samuels (1993) highlighted the necessity for an integrated approach between operational and strategic levels as the interdependence between the individual and environmental factors ensued (Andreasen 1997; Bhattacharya and Bell 1999). Concurrently, the
types of partnership engagement broadened to inter-sector partnerships to achieve change and ensure consistent messaging (Andreasen 1996).

Also a greater comprehension of the complexity of behavioural change emerged. Instead of seeking to solve individual problems, social marketers slowly began to discuss the issues that they were dealing with. Framing problems as issues acknowledged their complex nature which social marketers often found overwhelming (Geller 1989; Samuels 1993). As a result social marketing partnerships were developed to optimise the implementation of interventions as described in the previous era but also manifested at higher levels for strategic reasons, such as building competitive capacity and fulfilment of an advocacy role (Wallack, Dorfman et al. 1993). The power of policy reform was acknowledged as a strategy which could benefit or constrain stakeholder behaviours (Wallack, Dorfman et al. 1993; Rothschild 1999) and therefore influence partnership selection. There was also an awareness of an increase in rivalry between organisations offering the same solutions to societies problems (Andreasen 1995). By working together in a formal capacity, NPOs could formally share resources and keep their areas of interest relevant at a policy level. This formality manifested in guidelines for participation and the need for more formal contracts especially in areas where tension could manifest, attributed to a lack of consensus (Samuels 1993). This is particularly pertinent as funding from donors was decreasing and therefore organisations were searching elsewhere particularly to the private sector for support and access to target audiences (Allman 1998). The needs of different audiences were also beginning to be acknowledged. Requests for partnership relationships needed to go beyond the self interest of the organisation to promote mutual benefit between all parties involved (Andreasen 1997b). Strong partnership development were also influenced by factors including time and commitment. These factors allowed for the selection of partners that had a strategic fit and an opportunity to learn how the working relationships were formed (Williamson 1999).

In the previous period of cooperation the partnership levels were not routinely integrated. This disparity was highlighted by Geller (1989), who identifies multiple examples of behavioural change research and programmes targeted at the individual level (such as litter control) and an awareness of the more complex issues, which
encompass these individual behavioural changes such as air pollution. However, Geller (1989) found little evidence of multilevel large-scale interventions designed to tackle the problem as a whole (for example global warming). The comprehensive programming needed to address these issues relied upon collaborative action across sectors to facilitate institutional change (Samuels 1993).

These issues are built upon in the period of integrated systems.

### 2.2.3 Period of Integrated Systems 2000 – Present

During the period of formalisation, evidence suggests that social marketers fully accept the role of individual self-interest and collective society refocusing change strategies from traditional 4 P’s approaches to the promotion of healthy environments. Dorfman (2005) highlights that society’s wellbeing as a whole is now a composite of individual choices and the environments that guide them (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). This knowledge is coupled with this realisation that issues are becoming more integrated making differentiation between problems, causes and their solutions increasing difficult (Bye 2000). For example, the link between social factors and health status (Donovan 2000), calling for systemic change (Schwartz 2000) or a market with approach (Marques and Domegan 2011). The development of this perspective is discussed within this section.

#### 2.2.3.1 Increased Evidence of Partnerships Discussion

As the comprehension of the usefulness of social marketing partnership approaches intensifies so has the call for a ‘methodology for collaborative action’ (Bye 2000 p. 59). This is correlated with the application and discussion of the potential of partnerships in social marketing that has increased exponentially in the past ten years. The range and growth of information and learning highlights partnerships important role; however there remains a distinct lack of conceptual and empirical articles published in the area (Niblett 2005). This growth is instead embodied in case studies and/or commentaries discussing their formation or the future directions of social marketing (Lefebvre 2009). Conferences have also been utilised as a platform to discuss role of social marketing partnerships. For instance, partnerships
within social marketing emerged as a major theme at the Innovation in Social Marketing (ISM) conference in 2005; resulting in the publication of a special edition of the Social Marketing Quarterly in the Fall/Winter of that year. This special edition was dominated by round table discussions (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Niblett 2005; Sowers 2005; Williams 2005) and conference proceedings (Lee, Achermann et al. 2005) incorporating a mixture of academic and practitioner perspectives. These sessions identified a broad range of issues impacting on the development of social marketing partnerships and the discussion was divided between upstream, downstream and public-private sector partnerships within social marketing as well as a debate surrounding its definition.

As partnership formation within social marketing became more progressed, so did its acceptance as the ‘5th P in the social marketing mix. Weinrich (1999; 2011) was the first to present this perspective by highlighting the benefits of building connections and pooling resources to improve the reach of campaigns. This text focuses on the practical application of social marketing partnerships, with discussions ranging from possible mechanisms for partnering to the challenges encountered. A small proportion of the text is dedicated to discussing avenues for engaging in partnerships ranging from high to low involvement, which will be discussed later. More recently, Donovan and Henley (2011) also presented partnerships as an additional ‘P’ in the social marketing mix using EPODE and their achievements in the area of obesity as an example of how to effectively utilise this technique within social marketing. Donovan and Henley (2011) offers some concern about the lack of clarity within partnerships that are based on common goals and those that are not, implying the importance of appropriate partnership selection. They believe that without common goals a social marketing orientated campaign cannot exist.

More extensively, French (2010), and Andreasen (1995) have dedicated entire chapters within their textbooks to the practical application of partnerships within social marketing. These texts discuss how social marketing partnerships can increase the value of interventions (for example heart health Long, T., Taubenheim, A. M., et al. (2008) and osteoporosis Abercrombie, A., Sawatzki, D., et al. (2012)) and how to implement them at a basic practical level as well as to inform a total market approach. This momentum reemphasises the capacity for partnership
approaches. The types of issues that social marketers are now exposed to coupled with this market with mentality increases the numbers of stakeholders within the exchange and the necessity for building long term sustainable relationships (Roberts 2000; Marques and Domegan 2011). This perspective broadens the target audience of the social marketer beyond the individual to key influencers at every level of the social marketing system (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). Social marketers at the same time are cognisant that for strategies to be successful audiences need to be targeted utilising multiple channels and approaches simultaneously, thus reinforcing the reliance on partnerships (Fridinger and Kirby 2002). This type of comprehensive programming ensures that partnership creation is neither simple or direct process (Sowers 2005).

This reframing increases the potential for developing social marketing programmes at scale as the focus is on the market not the individual (Lefebvre 2011). Collaboration across and between settings, as suggested by French (2010) promotes the institutionalising of change across multiple settings, therefore creating awareness among individuals as well as dismantling environmental barriers. This systemic approach does not render the strategies utilised in the 1970s as obsolete. Interventions targeted at downstream change are still evident in the literature today, particularly partnerships to secure infrastructure and remain an important element of success (Brunetti, Forsyth et al. 2001). However, social marketers are continuing to work towards developing two-way relationships which are mutually beneficial (Brunetti, Forsyth et al. 2001). Partnerships within social marketing are now accepted as essential for the implementation of behavioural change programmes (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005).

### 2.2.4 Summary of the Three Eras of Social Marketing Partnerships

A number of observations arise from this periodisation. Firstly, as social marketing partnership characteristics have evolved with a changing society there is little evidence of a definition to guide their application. Secondly, no conceptual framework exists to guide their development. Thirdly, this periodisation has shown that social marketing partnerships continue to adapt to a changing society integrating both old and new strategies to facilitate social change.
To assist in comprehending the conceptual development of social marketing partnerships across the three eras, Table 2.1 presents the dominant characteristics emerging from the constant evolution of social marketing partnerships. Within Table 2.1, transactional and transformational partnership orientations have been distinguished. This differentiation emphasises the shift in mindset when engaging with social marketing partnerships from once off transactions to strategic systems level change. Although the role of the environment in shaping behaviours had been discussed in the 1980’s-1990’s, an integrated approach had not materialised. Evidence presented within this chapter suggests that social marketers adopted an either/or type strategy whereby they did not attempt to synergise the different levels in the social marketing system.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships by analysing the terms of reference adopted and the limited number of definitions available. This discussion builds on the evidence presented in Table 2.1 whereby the majority of the authors are discussing the development of social marketing partnerships within the period of integration.

### 2.3 Current Definitions of Social Marketing Partnerships

The preceding discourse highlights a momentum behind the implementation of social marketing partnerships as well as anecdotal evidence of the rationale for developing such relationships. This section examines the definition of social marketing partnerships and the influence it has over the key social marketing partnership characteristics.

Within the social marketing literature, there is little evidence of an explicit definition of social marketing partnerships leaving its boundaries open to interpretation (Niblett 2005) and terms meaning different things to different people (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). This lack of definition has resulted in the term being loosely used to “cover a range of relationships between two entities” (Sowers, Doner et al. 2005 p. 62) which has the potential to cause confusion as to what is and what is not deemed a social marketing partnership.
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Table 2.1 Evolution of Social Marketing Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional Characteristics Dominated until 2000</th>
<th>Transformational Approach 2000 onwards to address ‘wicked problems’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual focused (Andreasen 1997; Hastings and Donovan 2002)</td>
<td>Role of the individual and the environment (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service / Product orientated (Wymer 2010)</td>
<td>Systems perspective (Goldberg 1995; Donovan 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational (Goldberg 1995)</td>
<td>Strategic (French 2010; National social marketing centre 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro (MacFadyen, Stead et al. 1999)</td>
<td>Issue focused (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betterment (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
<td>Integration of levels (Up/ mid/ down) (Samuels 1993; Domegan 2008; Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen (Hastings 2003)</td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal change (French 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
<td>Longer term (Andreasen 1997b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macro (Gillies 1998; Andreasen 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural change (Donovan and Henley 2010; Lefebvre 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Welfare—referring to upstream (Donovan 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Market with’ (Marques and Domegan 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational (Marques and Domegan 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive programming or a Total Market Approach (Lefebvre 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difficulties defining this entity are further compounded by the vast array of terms that are used interchangeably by social marketing practitioners and academics alike to describe partnership relationships as shown in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2 Examples of Partnership Terms of Reference in the Social Marketing Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of partnership terms of reference adopted in the social marketing literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Alliances</strong> (Andreasen 1995; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Sowers, Doner et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross sectoral Alliances</strong> (Bhattacharya and Bell 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi stakeholder partnerships (Bhattacharya and Bell 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Alliances</strong> (Andreasen 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Alliances (Legarde, Berger et al. 1999; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005; Donovan and Henley 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cause related partnership</strong> (Andreasen 1996; Earle 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong> (Andreasen 1996; Donovan 2005; Donovan and Henley 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsorship</strong> (O’ Reilly and Madill 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Intervention</strong> (Arulmani and Abdulla 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder</strong> (Bye 2000; Singer and Kayson 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term alliance, for example, which is featured in multiple formats within the table, can be shown to mean different things to different users. For instance Legarde, Berger et al. (1999) make reference to collaboration, partnerships and social alliances in the same paragraph to describe a relationship that has progressed beyond philanthropy to become characterised as long term, having strategic goals for all parties involved and the sharing of tangible and intangible resources such as knowledge and capabilities. This interpretation is further collaborated in another
article whereby partnerships and strategic alliances are suggested to mean the same thing (Legarde, Doner *et al.* 2005). Conversely, in the same edition of the Social Marketing Quarterly, Sowers, Doner *et al.* (2005) are very explicit in their differentiation between partnerships and strategic alliances, the former distinguished through the equal stakes or resources. The latter in this case is thought to have a greater degree of self-interest, parties involved have diverse goals and have come together to fulfil a specific task of participants.

One explanation for the plethora of terms used to describe social marketing partnerships is the increase in openness to inter-sectoral relationships catalysed by systems thinking (Schwartz 2000; Madill and O’Reilly 2010). For example, as Madill and O’Reilly (2010) observed, the terms ‘partnership’ and ‘sponsorship’ have been used interchangeably. They argue that different entities in a social marketing relationship prefer different terms, suggesting that NPOs would describe their relationship as partners whereas Corporations would prefer the term sponsorship (Madill and O’Reilly 2010). In this exemplar sponsorship is defined as:

> “Where a corporation (or other investor) creates a link with an outside issue or event, hoping to influence the audience by the connection.” (O’Reilly and Madill 2007 p.1)

This definition is broad and raises a number of issues relating to what the relationship they are speaking of is. The reference to corporation and particularly other investor implies that the sponsor engages in a type of resource exchange to assert a connection with the audience. If this investment was interpreted as a funding exercise to benefit their organisation as opposed to sharing of resources to facilitate social change, its interpretation of social marketing partnerships is questionable (Sowers, Doner *et al.* 2005). Therefore the type of investment needs clarification and the rationale for engagement. This definition is framed by the organisations self interest in engaging in the partnership, and not the impact it will have on change or social good. It is a reminder of the one-way type of interaction that manifested during the period of coordination where relationships were developed to maintain funding as donors (Legarde, Doner *et al.* 2005) rather than a ‘strategic ally’ (Sowers, Doner *et al.* 2005 p.62).
Similarly to the term Alliance the overall appropriateness of interchangeable usage of the term sponsorship and partnership is difficult to assess due to the vagueness of its definition. Therefore the more formalised definitions that do exist in the literature are now examined and the common denominators discussed.

### 2.3.1 Formal Definitions of Social Marketing Partnerships

The lack of clarity which is apparent as a result of the diverse range of terms referring to social marketing partnerships is a theme that is concurrent throughout the discussion of its definition. Social marketing partnerships as a tenuous term is further emphasised by the International Social Marketing (ISM) steering committees decision not to offer a definition of partnerships to guide submissions to their conference in 2005:

> “The ISM Steering Committee chose not to be too prescriptive or restrictive in defining the term partner for the conference so that presenters and panellists would have sufficient flexibility to present many ideas and interpretations of partnerships as necessary, based on their experience and research” (Niblett 2005 p. 13).

This lack of guidance for submission of abstracts suggests that social marketers, at this time, were still in the scoping out phase of conceptualising the characteristics of social marketing partnerships. By choosing not to define partnerships within social marketing, the organisers symbolised that at that point the boundaries of social marketing partnerships were not fixed.

This conference epitomised a number of significant milestones in relation to partnerships in social marketing. Firstly, by selecting social marketing partnerships as the theme of the conference the importance of partnerships within social marketing was acknowledged. Coupled with the recognition that delegates repeatedly requested a focus on this topic reinforced the growing importance of the strategy (Niblett 2005). Secondly, the flexibility given to presenters in terms of interpreting the meaning of partnerships allowed a wide range of perspectives to be represented at the conference, including the three core elements discussed within the
periodisation at the beginning of this chapter (i.e. a downstream; upstream and integrated approach to partnerships). Thirdly, through including papers on public/private partnerships an openness to innovative approaches to relationships was acknowledged.

Converse to the rationale for not defining social marketing partnerships for those submitting abstracts; when contextualising the conference, Niblett (2005) was compelled to propose two definitions, which inadvertently suggest the importance of a definition. Significantly, both definitions presented were chosen from outside the discipline, which insinuates that the term has not been officially defined. The first definition adopted from Webster’s (1998) dictionary:

“A partner is an organisation associated with another (or others) in a common activity or interest; implies a relationship which each organisation has equal status and a certain independence but has a spoken or formal obligation to the other(s)” (Niblett 2005 p.13).

This definition offers more definitive boundaries to the relationship then the previously outlined definition of sponsorship. This definition highlights the importance of all parties involved and is not perceived to be as one dimensional as Macdill and O’Reilly’s (2010) interpretation of sponsorship. Also, within the earlier discussion of strategic alliances and partnerships, Sowers, Doner et al. (2005) identifies both equal status and a common purpose as a distinguishing characteristic of partnerships within social marketing. The reference to ‘interdependence’ is also important as many organisations when working in partnership maintain their own identity (Arulmani and Abdulla 2007).

The second definition deriving from a partnership study from the Academy of Educational Development (AED’s) and the U.S Agency for International Development defines partnerships as:–

“…a voluntary collaboration between two or more private sector, non-profit (or government) institutions that has: 1) a written agreement 2) goal of
mutual benefit; 3) resource transfers; and 4) substantive purpose” (Niblett 2005 p.13).

The second definition interprets collaboration as the activities that the parties undertake which are controlled by three underlying elements. Collaboration as suggested in Table 2.2 is a commonly used term to describe partnership working. Unlike the first definition, the types of potential partners are explicitly differentiating between profit and non-profit entities. There exclusion within the first definition may suggest that the type of organisation is irrelevant as long as their relationship fulfils the criteria. The introduction of the relationship is also significant as it reinforces a reciprocation within the parties involved whilst implying the presence of trust and commitment (Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007).

Both of Nibett’s (2005) definitions identify the necessity for a formalised element within partnerships. In reality a lack of formality has been a criticism of partnership formation in social marketing in the past, with practitioners equating its absence to limited campaign success (Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009). Both definitions also include the need for the sharing of goals or interest. A summary of the key characteristics of Niblett (2005) definition is shown in Figure 2.2.

Figure 2.2 Summary of the Key Characteristics of Niblett’s (2005) Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary key characteristics (Niblett 2005):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Equal status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common goal of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another definition is proposed by Donovan and Henley (2010) within their discussion of partnerships as the 5th P in the social marketing mix:-

“Alliances with organisations that share an interest in a social marketing area. They may also have access to distribution channels, resources and
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*audiences that can deliver the social marketing messages more effectively”*

(Donovan and Henley 2010 p. 284).

As previously indicated the use of the word alliance within the social marketing context can cause confusion as it means different things to different people. However, in this context its meaning is clear. This definition explicitly positions the target audience or the social marketing endeavour as the central motivation for participating in the partnership. Unlike the two definitions presented by Niblett (2005), it does not imply the need for an agreement between participants or specifically state the types of organisations that can be engaged in the partnership. Instead, it describes the benefits received by the alliance from the perspective of the impact the relationship will have on the audience not necessary the members of the partnership. Although the P’s of the marketing mix traditionally refer to downstream interventions (Kotler and Zaltman 1971), the benefits proposed are broad enough so that they can be interpreted from a downstream or upstream level.

Figure 2.3 Summary of the Key Characteristics of Donovan and Henley’s (2010) Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary key characteristics Donovan and Henley (2010):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared interest in a social marketing area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to Donovan and Henley (2010), Weinrich (1999) has described partnerships within social marketing as the 5th ‘P’ in the social marketing mix; however, like other authors who acknowledge the importance of partnerships, she neglects to offer an unequivocal definition. She characterises partnerships within social marketing through the benefits it offers for the programme:-

“Build connections with key people and organisations that have the potential to bring attention and credibility. By pooling resources and promoting the campaign through many organisation working towards the same goal, you
This explanation contains similar characteristics that have been discussed previously. The inclusion of the word ‘key’ insinuates a need to priorities the individuals that should engage within the partnership. It also suggests the higher impact of a partnership approach as opposed to organisations working in isolation on similar issues (Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008).

French (2010) proposes a further explanation of the definition of social marketing partnerships:

“Used in a positive sense to reflect the way different organisations can agree to come together around a shared commitment to a particular endeavour or cause. Partners bring different resources, skills and expertise to a partnership to achieve things that they could not achieve alone” (French 2010 p.309).

French (2010) used this implicit definition to clarify how partners or partnerships are distinguished from stakeholders. Regardless of the rationale for including this explanation French (2010) identifies key motivations and opportunities that are available through partnership development such as shared resources and values. It
also acknowledges the pivotal role of shared commitment as a unifying force for diverse organisations. The second half of this account introduces the importance of shared resources and cooperation as a key motivation for engaging in partnerships with the outcome of achieving greater reach.

French (2010) describes partnership formation as a positive process; a stance criticised by Niblett (2005) who suggests that this ‘positive’ perception of social marketing partnerships does not reflect the true developmental nature of this type of relationship and the difficulties that arise when trying to maintain them. Weinrich (1999) also acknowledges the difficulties encountered when developing partnerships by depicting situations that may be encountered throughout the partnering process (i.e. branding). The key to maintaining order within partnerships lies with communication of expectations and selecting partners whose goals converge (Singer and Kayson 2004; Long, Taubenheim et al. 2008; Temple, Long et al. 2008).

French (2010) continues to explore the definition of social marketing partnerships through a strong antithesis that social marketing partnerships go beyond a stakeholder relationship. In this regard stakeholders are described as:

“Typically people or organisations who have an interest in the issue that the social marketing programme is seeking to influence but who are not formally engaged in development and delivery of the programme” (French 2010 p. 309).

Stakeholders and partnership relationships in this context are differentiated through the level of commitment to the social marketing activity. Therefore for stakeholders to become partners they need to be actively engaged (Sowers 2005). Considering the role of the funding bodies, although committed this type of relationship has been criticised for lacking depth if participation is limited to annual meetings (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). French (2010)’s definition of stakeholders insinuates that partnerships are deemed as a more formal strategic approach to actively engaging in changing behaviours as opposed to passively supporting an idea. From a downstream perspective Sowers (2005) indicated the importance of stakeholder input in their supporting roles however; equally acknowledged the importance of
mobilising these parties into more proactive participants. This formal active role was verbally omitted in French’s (2010) initial definition of partnerships however; was alluded to through the willingness to share resources.

As discussed during the periodisation of social marketing partnerships, social marketers have a history of utilising intermediaries to operationalise their activities; however unlike their commercial counterparts these networks remain underdeveloped and lack clarity. Where commercial firms incorporate intermediaries as part of their business, they involve closed networks whereby roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, making negotiations easier (Donovan and Henley 2010). When scoping out intermediaries the social marketing network is often broad with members adopting various roles inside and outside this area. Goldberg (1995) identified difficulties in controlling desired intermediaries, using the school setting as an example; in some cases teachers are necessary to implement a programme but could be negatively predisposed to participation. Potential participants may not believe they do not mutually benefit from activities, are adequately rained or agree with the proposed strategy (Donovan and Henley 2010).

Figure 2.5 Summary of the Key Characteristics of French (2010) Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of key social marketing characteristics (French 2010):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared commitment to a particular cause or endeavour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Summary of Key Characteristics of a Social Marketing Partnership Definition

It remains difficult to define the nebulous term that is social marketing partnerships, particularly as the types of partners are becoming broader. However, regardless of the small number of prescriptive definitions that are available there are a number of profound characteristics that are dominant within the social marketing partnerships and will assist in establishing boundaries for their usage. These key characteristics
are shared interest/values, sharing of resources, equality; focus on a social marketing issue and priorities of partner, a summary is provided in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Summary of Dominant Characteristics in the Social Marketing Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Shared interest/values</th>
<th>Sharing of resources (tangible and in tangible)</th>
<th>Equality</th>
<th>Formal Agreement</th>
<th>Focus on the social marketing issue</th>
<th>Prioritise partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niblett (2005) (Def 1)</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niblett (2005) (Def 2)</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovan &amp; Henley (2010) (Def 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinrich (1999) (Def 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (2010) (Def 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section further conceptualises the distinguishing characteristics of social marketing partnerships by examining the existing social marketing partnership taxonomies. These taxonomies have been utilised as a mechanisms for interpreting the boundaries of social marketing partnerships and how to effectively implement the strategy.
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2.4 Social Marketing Partnership Taxonomies

As the preceding sections suggest there is little consensus amongst social marketers as to how to define the boundaries of social marketing partnerships. This assertion is offered despite a knowledge that most of the issues that social marketers are tasked with addressing are multifaceted and cannot be solved by one entity or sector on their own (Bye 2000; French 2010). There are however, examples of existing taxonomies published in the social marketing literature that assist in comprehending and classifying partnership processes. These examples differ from the checklists that practitioners have compiled on reflection of their own partnership activities; for example Weinreich (2011) and Thomas 2008, as they offer a structured approach to guide the development of social marketing partnership strategies. This section examines four taxonomies that are present within the social marketing literature:-

- Typology of Non–profit Competition (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000),
- A Partnership Continuum (Donovan and Henley 2010);
- Goal Convergence, Trust and Contacts in Social Marketing Partnerships (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005); and

These taxonomies are fundamentally emerging within the period of integrated systems and therefore the assumptions behind each taxonomy is related to the development of relationships which has been garnered from relationship marketing material. Each taxonomy in isolation provides valuable insight into the development of social marketing partnerships and when analysed together, assist in the identification of the dominant characteristics of social marketing partnerships. Thereby when discussing each of the taxonomies, the key constructs within the taxonomy are defined and discussed.
2.4.1 Taxonomy one: A Typology of Non–Profit Competition

Rothschild, Richie et al.’s (2000) Typology of Non–Profit Competition provides insight into the decision making processes for engaging in social marketing partnerships. This framework suggests that a non–profit’s actions when competing within a hyper competitive marketplace are dependent on their propensity to embrace conflict or collaborative working as separate entities at opposing ends of a continuum as shown Figure 2.6.

This taxonomy suggests that these decisions are guided by numerous internal and external factors including the mission of the organisation (what it seeks to achieve) and the needs of the target audience (Andreasen 1997b; Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). Conflict or combative competition relates to the organisations willingness to compete directly within their market space meaning the support for one organisation prevents the support of the other.

Referring to the opposite end of the continuum entitled Collegial Competition, Rothschild, Richie et al. (2000 p.67) identifies 3 criteria for engaging in cooperative behaviours:

1) Broad consensus as to what the problem is and how it is solved
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2) Fundamental issues of life and death
3) Demand for a service is overwhelming

At a basic level these indicators suggest that there must be an underlying rationale to engage in relationship building with these criteria implying that organisations are lead to cooperate based on problem definition.

The centre of the continuum labelled as an ‘alternative to competition’ is the strategy chosen by those who are not motivated to compete or cooperate. This strategy is equated to what has been defined within this research as complex style problems as described in Chapter 1, whereby the non–profits for example, agree on the problem however, disagree on the solution thereby choosing to develop a strategy that best reflects their own vision (Roberts 2000).

This taxonomy suggests that a number of important characteristics need to be present to enable social marketing partnership development which are shared values and a consensus of what the problem actually is. When discussing the three points on the continuum, Rothschild, Richie et al. (2000), refers to the mission or purpose of the organisation in the decision to cooperate or compete. This can be equated to shared values, whereby organisations that do not have commonalities cannot form relationships. As defined by Morgan and Hunt (1994 p.25) in the relationship marketing context shared values are:

“The extent to which partners have beliefs in common about what behaviours, goals and policies are important, appropriate or inappropriate, and right or wrong.”

Interpreting this concept within the social marketing context, it supports the assertion that when potential partners diverge in their overall mission or have differing interpretations of the social good they would like to achieve the relationship will not be successful as the organisational needs are inconsistent (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). Donovan and Henley (2011) deepens this discussion by asserting a necessity to distinguish between types of partners based on shared value/goals referring to non governmental organisations (NGO) and private sector partners as examples of
organisations whose goals may not converge. This perspective is also evident in
taxonomy three. Although private sector organisations have successfully assisted in
social marketing campaigns in the past, for example within the Heart Truth
Campaign (Temple, Long et al. 2008), due to ethical issues and dissonance of some
within the commercial sector, for instance the tobacco industry, there remains a
nervousness with this type of engagement (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005) leading to the
erosion of trust. Referring to the Heart Truth campaign as an example which raises
awareness amongst women about heart disease, a synergy between organisational
goals and missions were essential to ensure strategic fit of partnerships regardless of
the type (Temple, Long et al. 2008). This example highlights the importance of
exploring the potential of different types of cooperation (Dahl, Gorn et al. 1997).
However, Donovan (2011) introduces the characteristic ‘ethos’ which encapsulates
social marketing arguing that a private sector company merely donating money to
fund a vaccine programme based on the sale of their goods does not
equate to social
marketing. In this example, the goal and the motivation of the commercial
organisation is not the betterment of society, instead it is to increase profits therefore
arguing it cannot be classified as social marketing, instead more appropriately
corporate social responsibility (Donovan 2011). However, members contributing to
the partnership may have varying reasons for engaging in the relationship, in many
instances they seek to address common risk factors in order to achieve their own
organisational goals or self interest (Dahl, Gorn et al. 1997; Lefebvre 2006). In this
instance each party in the exchange achieves mutual benefit which motivates the
partnership in the long run (Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Sowers 2005).

Crutchfield and Grant (2008) articulate the basic elements needed to increase the
impact of non-profits through shared values. Primarily, parties involved in ‘systems’
level change should focus on the long term vision of reaching and having an impact
on the target audience and secondly, on the short term self–interest of the
organisation (Andreasen 1997b; Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Crutchfield and Mc Leod
Grant 2008; Temple, Long et al. 2008). For organisations that share values and wish
to cooperate they identify four tactics or opportunities to foster success:

1. Grow the pie – create networks of organisations with similar shared values
to build a platform to develop synergies for change.
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2. Share knowledge – this allows for an expansion of the skills sets within the network.

3. Develop leadership – Advocacy plays a large role in ‘systems’ level change and through development of leadership in a particular area will help share power and leverage the network.

4. Work in coalition – More recently in social marketing, partnerships have moved beyond conventional fit between NGOs and Government agencies towards innovative relationships including the public sector and their existing networks.

Additionally to the components outlined above, those who agree to a partnership approach should act in a responsible manner reflecting the aim of the social marketing programme. Through shared value, behaviours between parties in the relationship would include sharing resources, expertise and best practice approaches (Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009).

The second important factor within this taxonomy refers to motivation or willingness to cooperate. Social marketing partnership literature identifies motivation as a variable that is necessary for the sustainability of long term partnerships; however it remains an area that is difficult to maintain (Binney, Hall et al. 2003). When discussing motivation in a downstream consumer behaviour change context; characteristics such as self interest, desire and goal directed arousal are discussed (Binney, Hall et al. 2003). Similar characteristics are evident during the formation of relationships (Rothschild 1999). Differing types of partners may have diverse motivations for engaging in social marketing partnerships such as the fulfilment of a resource deficit (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005); however, they work together to fulfil a common goal whilst accomplishing their personal organisational mission (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). Without this construct, the trust and commitment needed to address the issue does not exist.

The third area that is relevant is cooperation. Morgan and Hunt (1994 p.26) when discussing relational exchange, operationalise cooperation as:
“A partner committed to the relationship will cooperate with another member because of a desire to make the relationship work.”

This desire underlines commitment to the relationship and the sharing of resources within the relationship. Rothschild (1999) when discussing his Motivation, Opportunity and Ability conceptual framework segments the target audience and therefore introduces three types of strategies (education, marketing and law) that may be needed to ensure positive behavioural change is adopted. Given the different techniques needed depending on the audience’s motivation, opportunity and ability to change, Rothschild (1999) believes that cooperation between parties will ensure goal convergence. Within this article Rothschild (1999) adopts Ouchi (1980) explanation of cooperation:

“Cooperative action necessarily involves interdependence between individuals. This interdependence calls for a transaction or exchange in which each individual gives something of value (for example, labour) and receives something of value (for example, money) in return.” (Ouchi 1980 p. 130)

Although this definition was first utilised in a commercial marketing and was developed over thirty years ago; its relevance to this discussion of social marketing partnerships is vindicated as this definition is not restricted to the traditional transactional perspective of exchange. For cooperation to materialise the sharing of tangible and intangible resources is paramount.

This discussion also identifies a deeper motivation than desire. The inclusion of interdependence incorporates the idea of value generation and transfer. Cooperation is identified as the action taken to achieve mutual goals through the sharing of resources (Anderson and Narus 1990; Morgan and Hunt 1994). This definition adds a second dimension to cooperation identified here as commitment related to this desire to make the partnership work. This enhances the importance of cooperation as social marketers are non profit oriented and the issues they seek to face are more complex than one person or organisation can face on their own (Bhattacharya and Bell 1999; Bye 2000; Crutchfield and McLeod Grant 2008; French 2010). The
reach and impact of efforts are also thought to increase through cooperative
behaviours (Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008); making cooperation a necessary
outcome of social marketing partnerships.

The final characteristic refers to the need for mutual benefit whereby organisations
work towards communal goals to solve the bigger problem however, whilst doing so
achieve their own organisational goals (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). This
concept arises in more detail in Taxonomy 2 below.

Although, this typology presents some useful insights into the decisions to partner, it
is argued that this typology is an overly simplistic representation of strategy
development. In an attempt to classify the decision making processes this continuum
does not account for an issue based perspective on strategy development, whereby
problems are deemed to be wicked where there is little consensus of what the
problem or solution is and greater scope for conflict (Roberts 2000).

Their criteria is also very restrictive in terms of the organisations rationale for
engaging in cooperative action, other motivations not referred to, include for,
example restrictions such as political reasons prohibiting an organisation from
participating (Samuels 1993). Finally, many organisations choose to partner to
increase their ability to compete in a competitive marketplace whereby there is
continued rivalry from those who are providing alternative solutions to the social
marketing problem (Peattie and Peattie 2003). Thereby they cooperate to be in a
position to be competitive.

In summary, this Taxonomy positions shared values, motivation, cooperation and
mutual benefit as important social marketing partnership characteristics. The next
Taxonomy is also a continuum however it is more focused on the social marketing
partnership process as opposed to the motivation for strategy development.
2.4.2 Taxonomy Two: Coalition Continuum

To assist social marketer’s comprehension and differentiation between the types or intensity of partnerships; Donovan and Henley (2010) introduced a continuum previously developed in consumer psychology to categorise cooperative working and examine power structures in society. This framework for categorising partnerships (see Figure 2.7) was adopted from Himmelman’s (2001) who presents coalition continuum which includes four strategies for classifying working in coalition which is defined as:

“All organisations working together for a common purpose”
(Himmelman 2001 p. 277)

As with the previous taxonomy the importance of having a shared value is reinforced this time through the inclusion of the term ‘common purpose’. Reflecting on Crutchfield and Grant (2008) articulation of shared values also discussed in the previous example, Figure 2.7 illustrates that the first identity on the coalition continuum begins with the development of a network of relationships and from this starting point the relationship matures and intensifies.

Unlike the previous example, this continuum uses resource sharing/allocation as a medium for classifying the ‘type’ of partnership that is adopted. This perspective is implicit in the preceding taxonomy through the decision to cooperate. This example examines the coalition from a point after the decision has been made to partner, not the actual decision making process. Although important, it does not necessarily use the organisations strategic position as a motivation for embarking on the partnership as an indicator. Instead, at every level mutual benefit is present and acts as a foundation on which the sharing of other resources is built upon.

Mutual benefits act as a precursor of partnerships as its presence moves this type of association from one way to a longer term reciprocal sustainable relationship (Brunetti, Forsyth et al. 2001). The importance of this construct is further

---

1 Not to be confused with other references to type made within this chapter which describes the background of the parties engaged in the partnership.
highlighted by the terms inclusion as an attribute in Niblett’s (2005) definition of partnerships (see section 2.3). In a social marketing context relationship benefits must be acquired to ensure that motivation to reach the end goals are maintained (Binney, Hall et al. 2003; Legarde, Doner et al. 2005) and all parties understand that the desired outcome of the partnership approach (Lee, Achermann et al. 2005). Mutual benefits can manifest as material or non-material benefits and could apply to for example ‘piggybacking’ on existing marketing distribution and brand channels (Long, Taubenheim et al. 2008) whereas non material benefits could reflect greater impact of advocacy at a strategic level.

Figure 2.7 Summary of Himmelman’s (2001) Coalition Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Turf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Exchange for mutual benefit</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit and altering activities for a common purpose</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operating</td>
<td>Exchanging information, altering activities, and sharing resources for mutual benefit and a common purpose</td>
<td>Significant amounts</td>
<td>High Levels</td>
<td>Significant amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources, and a willingness to enhance the capacity of another for mutual benefit and a common purpose. Involves sharing risks, resources, and rewards and, when fully achieved, can produce the greatest benefits of mutual action.</td>
<td>Significant amounts</td>
<td>Highest level of trust</td>
<td>Extensive sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted* from (Himmelman 2001) For the purpose of this research, Himmelman’s continuum has been summarised in table format by the author.
As suggested within Figure 2.7 the four strategies are not deemed independent, instead are considered representations on a developmental continuum evolving due to the presence of time, trust and turf. The definitions of these terms remain inherent within the text, turf seemingly referring to market space. As an organisation moves along the continuum, from networking to collaboration the requirements for the presence of each factor intensifies and implicitly the investment the organisation makes through the sharing or tangible and intangible resources also increases.

Reflecting on the principles of social marketing, voluntary behavioural change is one of the central ethos’, the issues it seeks to resolve are often complex, high involvement with limited instant gratification for adoption of altered behaviours (McDermott, Stead et al. 2005; Smith 2006). These fundamental characteristics predetermine that sustainable behavioural change will not occur overnight. Social marketing should be a long-term endeavour as citizens have to unlearn their old habits in order to adapt new ones (Kotler 1984). Activities are strengthened through the understanding that the goal of social marketers is to improve the overall well being of society and not the facilitator of the programme (Gordon, Mc Dermott et al. 2006). When describing the concept of time, Hastings (2006) identified time as the catalyst that turns trust into commitment. Also, without commitment there is no motivation to continue with the exchange (Singer and Kayson 2004).

In the commercial context, Garbinario and Johnson (1999) distinguish relational partnership exchanges from discrete transactions through the presence of commitment and trust. Hastings and Saren (2008) suggest that the absence of monetary exchanges in social marketing should strengthen the presence of commitment and trust as no one will benefit from financial gain. Garbarino and Johnson (1999 p.71) adopt Morman’s (1992) definition of commitment defining it as: ‘an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship’.

They argue that trust acts as a precursor of commitment as people will not commit unless they already trust.

Deriving from Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) definition of relational commitment again in the commercial marketing context; they define it as:
Chapter Two: The Evolution of Social Marketing Partnerships

“An exchange partner believing that an on-going relationship with another is so important as to warrant maximum efforts at maintaining it; that is the committed party believes that it endures indefinitely” (Morgan and Hunt 1994 p. 23).

The above definition goes beyond ‘desire’ (Garbarino and Johnson 1999) which was previously used to discuss motivations to cooperate. It identifies the motivation and intensity needed to continue the relationship and pursue it in the present as well as the future to drive co-operative behaviour. Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) accept this definition in their research into funder relationships as it outlines a certain willingness to engage in the relationship over the long term. To address the multifaceted issues that are emerging in society, social marketing partners must engage in this level of commitment in order to facilitate behavioural change. Change in this environment often needs a high involvement approach (McDermott, Stead et al. 2005; Smith 2006) therefore it is also accepted as an appropriate definition within the social marketing domain.

As previously articulated the ‘social issues’ that are being addressed through social marketing are often more complex than selling commercial products (McDermott, Stead et al. 2005) and often incorporate more than one variable or influence (Bloom and Novelli 1981). Social marketers seek to change complex behaviours with sustainable results, differing from commercial marketing through the promotion of non-monetary exchanges (Smith 2006). In scenarios where risk and uncertainty are present, for example the symptoms experienced giving up smoking; persuasive techniques revolve around the existence of trust (Desai 2009). Trust in this sense is also enhanced through the collaboration with key opinion leaders (Schwartz 2000), it can also be diminished with the improper selection of a partner (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). Trust is synonymous with credibility (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005), its presence also assists in the assertion of boundaries within the relationship (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000). Choi et al. (2007) suggests that the development of a knowledge-based society characterised by intangible and tacit resources increases the need for trust among consumers and organisations. This trusting relationship has an important impact on partnership selection and how the consumer perceive the partnership. Within social marketing the link between the benefits and the behaviour
within society is taken on trust, which is what differentiates social marketing from commercial marketing (Peattie and Peattie 2003).

Glenane-Antoniadis, Whitwell et al. (2003) propose that trust and mutually giving relationships are central to social marketing and would benefit from greater research into their role in fostering success for social marketers. Schwartz (2000) suggests that trust in social marketing relationships is the triangulation between the programme, audience and behaviour. Like other areas of marketing, it remains difficult to find to define trust in the social marketing setting. Trust explicitly stated has been identified as essential for the success of a given relationship (Garbarino and Johnson 1999). Defined by Morgan and Hunt (1994) trust is established:

“When one party has confidence in an exchange partners reliability and integrity” (Morgan and Hunt 1994 p.23).

When further describing the boundaries of trust, Morgan and Hunt (1994) identify other key variables including the ability to perform through enterprise, intentionality and confidence. Other factors such as willingness are believed to be important (Garbarino and Johnson 1999) however, Morgan and Hunt argue that it is implicit in the above definition. In the context of the non-profit sector Macmillan and Money et al. (2005) reject Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) conceptualisation of trust on the basis that it was too transactional in nature as it was developed for a business to consumer setting. However, other definitions of trust are just as problematic when transferred to the social marketing domain. For example, Ganesan (1994 p.1) determine trust as: “necessary for the perception of a fair division of the pie of resources in the future”. In the social marketing domain, the partners in the relationship do not necessarily benefit from outcomes as they strive for behavioural change for the individual.

Revisiting the definition of trust proposed by Morgan and Hunt (1994); it is accepted that their definition exudes commercial undertones. However; reliability and integrity are also important artefacts of trust within social marketing relationships. As with commitment, the difficulties within the recourse of the relationship such as indirect intangible benefits means that trust in social marketing relationships must be
high (Hastings 2007). Within the social marketing literature, the dimension of credibility is referred to a greater degree than trust.

It is proposed that as a dimension of trust, credibility has a significant impact on the longevity of the relationship (Ganesan 1994). This definition identifies how trust develops into commitment over time. Garbarino and Johnson (1999) propose that those who are committed to an endeavour are at risk due to vulnerability and sacrifice and therefore trust is needed to commit.

The definition used to guide analysis of this variable has been adapted from the area of marketing management. Trust is hereby defined as:

“The willingness to rely on an exchange partner with whom one has confidence”. (Friman, Gårling et al. 2002)

One of the key purposes of engaging in partnership development is to continue to build on an established trusting relationship. The characteristics of effective social marketing partnerships previously described highlight the importance of building credibility throughout the social marketing endeavour, which in turn strengthens trust. Partnership selection processes are essential to ensure that all relationships meet the expectations of the social marketing cause, if this fails it may erode the credibility of the programme through for example conflicts of interest which in turn will diminish any trust that has been established between other partnerships and the cause (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). Trust in social marketing partnerships represents an intention to perform (expertise) as part of the partnership agreement and with this comes intentions for future behaviour and reliability.

Within this taxonomy relationship commitment and trust have been established as core elements of partnership development; these can be further enhanced or eroded. The next taxonomy examines the implications of partnership selection on the previously discussed characteristics such as trust and commitment.
2.4.3 Taxonomy Three: Goal Convergence, Trust and Contacts in Social Marketing Partnerships

This taxonomy of social marketing partnerships was incorporated as part of a panel discussion at the 2005 Innovations in Social Marketing Conference. This panel of academics and practitioners were tasked with debating the role of partnerships within three areas. The areas included the marketing mix, the implementation of partnerships, and the adoption multi-sectoral approaches to partnership development. From the outset the breadth of potential types of partners participating in social marketing programmes was acknowledged and classified into four principle entities:

1. Non-governmental organisations (NGO) involved in advocacy, public education, research, and/or providing services
2. Government Organisations in which both politicians and bureaucrats are active
3. Community Organisations (amateur sport, recreation, leisure etc)

This classification aids in partnership selection process as organisations within the same sector are thought to have similar goals and motivations; therefore share values and have a good strategic fit. This level of understanding also assists in the management of expectations as similar organisations also have similar levels of commitment to goals (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). This understanding is permeated with the identification of three determinants of partnership working (Goal Convergence, Level of Trust and Formal Contract) which impact on decisions to form partnerships in social marketing as highlighted in Figure 2.8.

This matrix (Figure 2.8) includes a spectrum ranging from high to low assessing commonalities between entities based on their organisation culture and structure which could impact on the progression of the partnership. The ‘type’ of partner you are predetermines the perceived level of congruence to the initiative. Much debate has arisen around the ethical considerations of multi-sectoral partnerships particularly those public/private in nature (Hastings 2007; Donovan and Henley 2010).
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Figure 2.8 Initial Levels of Goal Convergence, Trust and Need for Formal Contracts Between Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Convergence</th>
<th>NGO – NGO Government</th>
<th>NGO – NGO Community</th>
<th>NGO – NGO Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Absent, low or conflicting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of trust</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal contract needed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005 p.39)

As with any other type of partnership, the two entities, for example the NGO and a private company’s actions, are undertaken for mutual benefit (Andreasen 1996). It is the idea of private companies benefiting from social marketing partnerships, which leads to an ethical quandary in the minds of some social marketers and therefore minimises trust. Contrary to Legarde, Doner et al.’s (2005) attestation of subjacent goal conversion between NPOs and the Public sector, Smith (2000) proposes that similar organisations often converge around common risks or causes and therefore have a more natural fit than private sector partners that are profit driven.

The ‘Heart Truth’ campaign, is an example of an effective social marketing initiative which piggybacked on an existing infrastructure for message delivery (Long, Taubenheim et al. 2008). Private sector companies can enhance visibility and credibility; however, conflicts of interest could also damage trust between partners and the audience (Smith 2000). Social marketing partnerships play an astute role in creating influence in campaign through leverage of resources, heft and reach benefiting from mutual reciprocity between levels (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). Related to this discussion the next section examines the types of partners in this taxonomy.
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Strategic partnership selection has become imperative within social marketing (Andreasen 1995; Williams 2005; Temple, Long et al. 2008) especially as practitioners acknowledge that their efforts are being impeded by upstream barriers (Williams 2005). There are four different types of partnership as evident in the social marketing literature as outlined in Taxonomy three.

2.4.3.1 Non–governmental Organisations (NGO)/ Community Organisations

NGOs and government organisations were traditionally the main precursors of social marketing campaigns (El - Ansary and Kramer Jr 1973) who seek to reach audiences with their messages (Andreasen 1996). Non-profit agencies are continually tasked with seeking funding to sustain their activities (Andreasen 1996). This lack of resources has resulted in them more amenable to partnership endeavours, searching with a broader perspective and turning to the private sector as a revenue stream (Cotroneo, Hazel et al. 2001). NGOs are entities who are social goal orientated as opposed to profiteering which leaves them more susceptible to cooperation in social marketing endeavours (Rothschild, Ritchie et al. 2000).

2.4.3.2 Government Organisation

Agendas are usually set by policy implementation and funding is secured from government funding.

2.4.3.3 Public-Private Partnerships

Public-private partnerships emerge when government and NGOs engage with the corporate sector, an experience, which has lead to successful results (Temple, Long et al. 2008). Although the social marketing literature remains divided on the topic of engaging with private companies in social marketing, evidence exists of the utilisation of private/public partnerships as far back as 1967. At this time social marketers partnered with pharmacies to improve their distribution of condoms in India (Lefebvre 2011).
Expansion within the private sector has increased pressure for corporations to be accountable for a wider group of stakeholders and therefore socially responsible (Bhattacharya and Bell 1999). Whilst Legarde, Berger et al. (1999) suggest that the role of governments in addressing societal issues have changed leading to corporations shifting from a philanthropy approach to a more active role in partnerships. This means that exchanges within the relationship have evolved from primarily economic to economic and non-economic exchange including managerial expertise, communication monitoring etc (Legarde, Berger et al. 1999). As private enterprises are beginning to succumb to the potential rewards of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) complementing the goals of the business (Legarde, Berger et al. 1999), social marketers are also realising the potential of developing this type of multifaceted partnership (Temple, Long et al. 2008; French 2010).

The benefit this opportunity presents is not without its challenges, however, as much debate has manifested in the social marketing literature relating to these relationships. It is outside the remit of this research to discuss in detail the positive and negative aspects of Corporate Responsibility, however some of the issues have diffused into the social marketing literature; particularly in the last era.

Since the 1960s private companies have been used by social marketers to fund programmes but also to access hard to reach target audiences through established networks (Andreasen 1995; French 2010). Operationally, private sector companies have built expertise in areas such as advertising, research, promotion and product distribution and therefore can offer valuable skills and expertise to complement the areas where social marketers lack (Andreasen 1995; Temple, Long et al. 2008). Whilst giving private corporations the opportunity to enter new markets (Allman 1998), increased funding opportunities through the private sector can also extend the longevity (Andreasen 1995) of campaigns and increase stability by reducing reliance on donations (Allman 1998). They also increase reach, heft and visibility through association with a familiar entity (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). Public private coalitions are also becoming more popular due to an understanding of the deficit in skills, expertise and resources in the public sector (Eagle 2009). They can also ensure that products are affordable and accessible to target citizens as well as
identify potential markets for expansion (Armand 2008; Hudson, Snawder et al. 2008). Corporations who have a shared interest in an issue and who’s product fit with the campaign can play a strategic role in expanding activities and maximising message delivery; for example pampers involvement in the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDs) (Cotroneo, Hazel et al. 2001). This shared interest is particularly important to increase commitment to the venture (Earle 2005).

Although public–private partnerships seem to offer attractive benefits for the social marketers, there are disadvantages that need to be considered. If managed incorrectly they can also be characterised as short lived campaigns which do not live up to expectations (Andreasen 1996). When referring to private sector motivations and the benefits they receive from engaging in social marketing projects, phrases such as renting respectability and a ‘halo’ effect are evident in the literature (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005 p.21). Similarly whilst discussing the potential of cause-related partnerships, Earle (2005) utilises comparable language to portray the potential dynamics of an impending relationship:

“They’ve got the money, and you’ve got the halo. Surely something can be worked out to the benefit of both.” (Earle 2005 p.104)

Donovan (2011) remains critical of the view that any partner is a good partner. He too considers the motivations corporations have for engaging in campaigns and suggests that profitability remains the driving force for donating to causes not the socially desirable goals of the social marketer. Social marketing is rarely concerned with profitability (Peattie and Peattie 2003). Donovan’s (2011) reservations become more pronounced when analysing the twelve motivations listed by French (2010) as to why a corporation would partner with the public sector ranging from strengthening their brand position, increasing their appeal to investors and influencing public policy. None of the motivations listed refer to shared values with the social marketing effort; instead proponents believe they are driven by their own self interest (Sowers 2005). Temple, Long et al (2008) whilst describing the partnerships utilised within the ‘Heart Truth’ campaign argues that through engagement with the campaign the ‘self–interest’ of all parties were served which resulted in mutual benefit. Other motivation relate to monetary gains include
increasing consumer confidence in corporations in response to an environment where consumers increasingly distrust corporations due to publicised ethical malpractices. From the perspective of the corporation rebuilding this trust can be directly related to competitiveness (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). At an upstream/policy level, companies who engage in social marketing efforts may build their reputation and contact base with the government, which could be beneficial in the future.

Thomas (2008) identified the importance of partner selection as a means to protect existing levels of trust and continued valuation of the brand. French (2010) purports that trusting relationships develop through active partnerships cemented through the sharing of resources as opposed to traditional styles of partnerships that were secured to secure funding. Safeguards can be established to reinforce trust such as partnership agreements which identify how different partners should participate (Weinreich 1999).

The literature shows that for each type of partner there are advantages and disadvantages for each selection, which in turn highlights the complexity of Social Marketing partnership development (Sowers 2005). One aspect which impacts on this relationship in the need for a formal contract i.e. transparent communication as identified within Figure 2.8 page 64.

2.4.3.3 Communication

Effective communication is an effective means of improving trust and credibility within an organisation through transparency and enhancement of expectation (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). Communication remains a core persuasive mechanism utilised in social marketing to facilitate behavioural change. It is also an effective tool within partnerships to prevent and diffuse problems before they arise (Weinreich 1999; Weinreich 2011). Effective regular communication is necessary to foster long term productive relationships between parties which operationally benefit the target audience; however from a strategic communication perspective also enabled the agencies involved to monitor progress (Singer and Kayson 2004; Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009). In a case study described by Ojeda, Hiller et al. (2009) previous interventions that lacked communication or a formalised relationship resulted in campaigns that
did not fulfil their potential. Singer and Kayson (2004) identified poor timing and direct communication as a limiting factor within their campaign as partners became concerned about the direction of the campaign, which resulted in a lack of ownership in the campaign.

The manner in which the message is communicated will also impact on its positioning as a communication strategy (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). Partners may share the same overall goal; however methods of achieving objectives may be reframed to facilitate change reflecting structural versus transactional style approach. Dorfman (2005) illustrates media advocacy as a tool used in upstream level to focus on the issue broadening the issue whilst narrowing the power gap between the individual and those opposed to change (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005). Communications are limited to the capabilities of the organisation and often have to communicate relatively long pieces of advice in a short period of time (Bloom and Novelli 1981). Through downstream initiatives communication can be enhanced by piggybacking on established networks improving impact and reach through effective branding of initiatives (Long 2008). Communication of programmes can also influence through the incorporation of authority figures who can enhance credibility to the campaign whilst reinforcing the messages (Lefebvre and Flora 1988). Reciprocal communication can insure that the expectations of all parties are met whilst increasing political cachet (Samuels 1993).

Legarde, Doner et al. (2005) suggest partnerships range from eager to hostile, the latter of which could be positively managed through effective communication including personal interaction between partners as well as continuous feedback. They propose that training and evaluation can help keep members informed. Within relationship marketing, a dialogue process enhances working relationships through the promotion of a common knowledge platform which contributes to shared meaning between partners (Marques and Domegan 2011).

Communication within organisations participating in social marketing activities becomes important when trying to manage interorganisational issues which can manifest when different disciplines/ experts who share similar overall goals however seek to adopt different approaches to problem management (Goldberg 1995).
Integration across the levels/system to increase likelihood of taking up the message (Lefebvre 2011). From this perspective, developing and maintaining a relationship over the long term is a time consuming and resource intensive process. Roles and responsibilities need to be established as well as boundaries of control, misunderstandings can lead to undesired tension and conflict within the network (Thomas 2008). From an implementation or a functional capacity, when establishing potential partnerships the role of each member needs consideration leading to dialogue and discussions in relation to their capacity to participate (Sowers 2005). To ensure opportunities are not lost through partnership development screening processes accessing fit and formal contracts can ensure that trust and goal convergence are maintained (Bentz, Dorfman et al. 2005).

Morgan and Hunt (1994 p.25) believe that ‘relevant, timely and reliable information’ has a positive impact on trust within relational exchanges. Macmillan and Money et al. (2005) extended their interpretation to include informing, listening and staff interactions reflecting the two–way approach to communication. Reflecting on the directional change taking place within social marketing from a ‘transactional’ to a ‘transformational’ type changes; it is important that communication as a mediating variable is expanded to reflect this change. Therefore, horizontal and vertical integration of communication mechanisms should be further investigated.

This discussion of communication also introduces a further outcome of partnership working, namely, tension which can positively or negatively impact on developments (Niblett 2005). The previously outlined characteristics of social marketing partnerships have all identified positive attributes for their utilisation. However, the social marketing literature purports that partnership management processes are not always positive or successful (Niblett 2005). Although partners enter agreements under their own free will and share communal values, characteristics such as management styles, loss of ownership and control can cause partners to lose motivation (Thomas 2008) which can manifest in tension. Other areas of frustration include partners who fail to participate as expected or go off strategy (Weinreich 1999). Social marketing partners can have enthusiasm for the relationship and the potential for the initiative; however, partnerships can still be
weak and fragile due to other factors impinging on activities such as funding and the complexity of working in diverse areas (Ojeda, Hiller et al. 2009).

This Taxonomy highlights the dominant characteristics evident when engaging in social marketing partnerships. Unlike the previous two examples it differentiates between the different types of partners and the impact they have on the presence of key social marketing characteristics such as trust and shared values.

2.4.4 Taxonomy Four: A multi-relationship Model of Social Marketing

The final taxonomy relates to a relational paradigm shift within the social marketing domain. Social marketing is a strategy in which socially desirable goals can be achieved (Donovan and Henley 2010) and therefore is concerned with understanding two aspects of human behaviour; the individual or citizen and key stakeholders who exert influence (Hastings and Saren 2003). Relational thinking emphasises the importance of relationships and network approaches (Hastings and Saren 2003) whilst presenting an alternative logic which positions the citizen as a co-creator in the value creation process (Marques and Domegan 2011).

Relationship marketing represents a major paradigm shift within marketing theory, moving knowledge and practice from a transactional to a relational perspective on exchange (Dwyer, Schurr et al. 1987; Morgan and Hunt 1994 p. 23). Relationship marketing as an approach that has grown in stealth over the past decade (Gunner Mattson 1997; MacMillan, Money et al. 2005). A term first adopted by Berry in the 1980s (Tadajewski and Saren 2009), Gummeson (1994 p.5) simply defines relationship marketing as “marketing seen as relationships, networks and interaction” in their simplest form involving two parties and as this grows developing into networks.

This conceptualisation marks a change in orientation from short term isolated transactions towards a customer orientated approach seeking to retain them (Bowen and Shoemaker 1998). Rationale exchanges, as opposed to their transactional counterparts, differ in terms of time and how the relationship is perceived in the future (Dwyer, Schurr et al. 1987). Over time, the relationship should seek to
generate increased value for the customer (Gronroos 1997). Morgan and Hunt (1994) conceptualise relationship marketing as:

“All marketing activities directed toward establishing, developing and maintaining successful relational exchanges” (Hunt and Morgan p. 23; Morgan and Hunt 1994 p. 22).

This definition recognises that relationship marketing can be applied without the presence of a customer. That is to say that it can apply to other forms of relational exchanges such as partners; as illustrated in Figure 2.9.

Figure 2.9 Relationship Exchanges in Relationship Marketing

Source (Morgan and Hunt 1994 p.21)

Referring to social marketing theoretical development, the adoption of the central tenets of the relational paradigm is in a period of formation and remains a
perspective that has yet to fully transfer into the realm of social marketing (Hastings 2003; Hastings and Saren 2003; Hastings 2007). Evidence, in the practitioner literature, reiterates the importance of developing long term relationships (Crutchfield and McLeod Grant 2008) to compete against, for example, commercial counterparts. The products and services that are promoted and supplied by commercial firms are encouraging negative behaviours and contributing to wicked problems (Donovan 2011).

As previously emphasised social marketers are continually faced with complex and wicked issues, whereby problems are becoming increasingly interrelated calling for synergies between multi cross-sectorial actors (Bye 2000). This has resulted in a shift in emphasis from discrete isolated exchanges evident in traditional interventions towards a long-term systems change approach incorporating institutional and social change. Hastings (2007; 2003) has begun to narrow the gap between social marketing theory and practice by arguing that social marketing shares common denominators with its relationship marketing counterparts such as customer satisfaction, trust and commitment; whilst others argue that it is more substantial foundation for social marketing theory and practice (Peattie and Peattie 2003; Marques and Domegan 2011). More recently, Marques and Domegan (2011) vindicate relationship theory within social marketing as a means of addressing these issues in a pluralist society. Therefore from a partnership building perspective, social marketing relational exchanges are developed over time by engaging with many different stakeholders (Hastings 2007). Desai (2009) also argues that social marketers have opportunities to develop partnerships to ‘co-create value’ however, this potential remains limited as little research has taken place on how to transfer and apply relational exchanges within the social marketing context (Desai 2009).

By thinking in terms of mutually beneficial exchanges, relationships move beyond focusing on target behaviours towards interactions that synergise a total market movement. This approach moves the focus beyond behavioural change in isolation to encompass relationship building, which remains a complex process due to the multiple actors involved in social marketing activities (Marques and Domegan 2011). To exemplify the potential for this transition within social marketing from discrete transactions to relationships, Hastings (2007; 2003) developed a multi-
relationship model of social marketing (Figure 2.11). As with the other taxonomies, trust and commitment remain central to the development of these relationships (Morgan and Hunt 1994; Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007).

This framework adapted from Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) depiction of Relationship Exchanges in Relationship Marketing (Figure 2.9) illustrates how social marketers can adopt a dynamic approach to developing relationships across different levels. Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original model identifies ten discrete forms of relationship marketing; categorised as supplier, lateral, internal and buyer partnerships representing the different types of relational exchanges that can take place with the focal firm (Varadarajan and Cunningham 1995). The incorporation of intra and interorganisational relationships broadens the understanding of relational exchange. The majority of empirical and theoretical research conducted within the domain of relationship marketing has focused on economic exchanges for profiteering in a business to business marketplace (Arnett, German et al. 2003). However, the benefits of relational exchanges extend beyond monetary to “noneconomic satisfactions and engage in social exchange” (Dwyer, Schurr et al. 1987 p. 12).

Long term relationships have developed as a core competitive advantage in an increasingly hyper-competitive global marketplace (Ganesan 1994; Morgan and Hunt 1994; Lewin and Johnston 1997; Arnett, German et al. 2003); and have materialised as networks of multiple interactions (Cravens and Piercy 1994). This orientation has resulted in a dependency on cooperation between parties within the relationship (Doney and Cannon 1997) a move differentiating discrete transactions and longer term relational exchanges (Hunt and Morgan). This differentiation has impacted on the customer who are now seen as partners as opposed to targets (Bowen and Shoemaker 1998). As outlined in hyper competitive marketplaces, firms must build competencies to compete through ‘cooperative interorganisational exchange’ (Morgan and Hunt 1999 p.281). This evolution beyond business to consumer relationships makes relationship marketing’s application more relevant in the social marketing domain; particularly as endeavours are not always focused on the individual or customer; instead involving numerous different types of stakeholders (Hastings 2007).
Figure 2.10 illustrates a multi-relationship model of social marketing. This classification scheme, distinguishes between the different types and roles of partners engaging in social marketing activities.

As suggested by Marques and Domegan (2011) the role of the actors in each category becomes blurred as each exist to assist in the co-creation of value as a result of the relationship. Hastings (2006; 2003) describes the relevance of each domain however does not clarify the similarities and differences between the two models.

Within both Figures 2.11 and 2.12, the consumer and the funder are classified in the same domain as Buyer Partners. When engaging in partnerships social marketers should anticipate the needs of the partner within an engagement process as much of
that of the consumer to ensure motivation continues whilst enhancing a commitment
to the relationship (Andreasen 1997b). Limitations with the funder relationships
have been assessed in the past by short term evaluation, the same way individual
focused once off interventions were criticised for not contributing to change
(Marques and Domegan 2011). Also, viewing funders as solely a source of money
neglects to acknowledge the other resources they may invest in the relationship. By
setting realistic objectives for both the target citizen and the funder facilitates a long
term outlook and therefore increases commitment (Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007).
This explanation mirrors the essential elements that were outlined in Andreasen
(1995) whereby voluntary behavioural change and the welfare of society remain the
central tenets of social marketing activities.

Hastings (2007; 2003) multi-relationship model of social marketing differs from the
others discussed within this chapter as Hastings categorises partners from a holistic
perspective identifying the interdependencies between multiple layers. They reflect
the down, mid and upstream layers within the social system as well as horizontal and
vertical relationships as outlined by (French 2010). Taking Rothschild, Richie et al.
(2000) taxonomy one (2.4.1) for example by incorporating lateral partners, Hastings
(2003) identifies the importance of building relationships with similar entities within
the competitive environment particularly in a cluttered market space. By partnering
with organisations with similar values resources can be shared, increasing
efficiencies as well as collectively setting agendas for public and policy level change
(Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007). In this capacity organisations can maintain their
organisational goals however; synergise to met an overarching goal which they have
may in common (Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008). This type of cooperation
can be difficult as NGOs and similar type organisations continue to compete for
funding from similar sources (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005) therefore as the other
taxonomies suggests time and the long term vision for the partnership is what will
bind it together.

The use of what were previously described as intermediaries, particularly in the
period of coordination, is acknowledged as an important strategic decision. Even at
this level where social marketers seek access to established networks, goal
convergence must be apparent. By mobilising these intermediaries from short term
once off exchanges to longer-term relationships with explicit goals will result in the strengthened trust and commitment between these entities. In this regard, Hastings (2007; 2003) acknowledges the role of time however it is not explicitly included in his diagram.

An addition to this discussion is the important role of internal partners within the partnership process. The other three taxonomies imply that engagement in the partnership equates to organisational support. Hastings (2007) explicitly identifies the need for organisations within partnerships to work as one entity (Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007).

2.4.5 Taxonomy Summary

Referring back to the periodisation of social marketing partnerships which marks a shift in orientation from coordinated partnerships to a integrated perspective, expediency for the acknowledgement and application of relation exchanges intensifies (Hastings and Saren 2003; Hastings 2007). To facilitate systems level change, intersectional partnership strategies are needed which moves the focus from down or upstream approaches to a synergised outlook (Schwartz 2000). For the implementation of this type of partnership to be successful social marketers need to adopt a long term view to ensure sustainable social change manifests (Lefebvre and Flora 1988) and therefore adopt a broader mind-set to change systems instead of the individual (Donovan 2000).

Based on the discussion above Table 2.4 summarises the dominant characteristics identified within the discussion of the social marketing partnership taxonomies.
Table 2.4 Social Marketing Partnership Taxonomy Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxonomy One</th>
<th>Taxonomy Two</th>
<th>Taxonomy Three</th>
<th>Taxonomy Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared interest/ Values</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of resources (tangible and in tangible)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreement</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the social marketing issue</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise Partners</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Key Mediating Variables of Social Marketing Partnerships

The proceeding discussions mapped the development of SM partnerships as well as the taxonomies that have emerged to guide their establishment. The following section examines the Key Mediating Variables of Social Marketing Partnerships. Firstly, it discusses the role of commitment and trust as central to the establishment
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of Social Marketing partnerships. Secondly, it will clarify the variables that act as antecedents and outcomes of the presence of these first order variables.

The social marketing partnerships that have dominated are summarised in the section below.

2.5.1 Relationship Commitment and Trust

From a social marketing perspective commitment and trust are thought to be greater amongst parties whom do not receive monetary rewards for their activities (Hastings and Saren 2003). Trust is particularly pertinent when partners are engaging with partners they are not familiar with or a new system. It allows for a working relationship to manifest in the presence of different value or marketing systems (Choi, Eldomiaty et al. 2007). This type of cross-sectoral transfer impacts on the level of trust and therefore commitment because it also introduces new types of transactions (Andreasen 2001).

2.5.2 Antecedents of commitment and trust defined

2.5.2.1 Mutual Benefits

The type of knowledge transfer that Andreasen (2001) introduces is identified to be reciprocal meaning that it penetrates deep within the system. This type of sharing of resources only manifests when the organisation is committed to the relationship and can benefit from it in some manner. For example, the partnership assists in meeting goals within the social change market place.

2.5.2.2 Shared Values

Shared values were identified as one of the most essential elements for social marketing partnerships to achieve high impact (Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008). The sharing of values equates to goal convergence which is directly related to the presence of trust (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005). Similarly, the presence of
shared values is a precursor of commitment as it reduces the presence of tension, which erodes trust and therefore has an impact on commitment.

2.2.5.3 Communication

Poor communication within partnerships unnecessarily diminishes the level of trust within a partnership. Trust is enhanced when, for example, the expectations, roles, and responsibilities are explicitly stated and as a result diminished any arising confusion (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005).

2.5.3 Outcome of Commitment and Trust in Social Marketing Partnerships

2.5.3.1 Motivation

Motivation in a social marketing partnership is related to self interest in the endeavour which turns short term relationships to long term partnerships and is therefore directly related to commitment.

2.5.3.2 Cooperation

Cooperation is symbolised by the sharing of tangible and intangible resources and is identified as a direct outcome of commitment and trusting relationships. This perspective encompasses knowledge sharing, value adding expertise and expectations of brand leveraging (Lee, Achermann et al. 2005).

2.5.3.3 Tension

Negative behaviours on the part of any member of the partnership could have a negative impact on the behavioural change strategy (Bhattacharya and Bell 1999). Negativity manifests in social marketing relationships as tension which directly erodes the level of trust within the relationship (Thomas 2008).
In order to further test the existence of these key constructs theoretical research propositions have been developed to guide data collection.

2.6 Summary of Research Propositions

Within this chapter the dominant characteristics of Social Marketing Partnerships referred to within as Key Mediating Variables (KMV) were analysed. Drawing from this discussion four research propositions are developed to represent the casual relationships present in social marketing partnerships, these include:

\[ P1: \] The presence of relationship commitment and trust are central to the development of SM partnerships.

\[ P2: \] Without the presence of trust, commitment will not manifest.

\[ P3: \] Mutual benefit, shared values and communication are key antecedents to SM partnership development.

\[ P4: \] Motivation, tension and cooperation are outcomes of the presence of commitment and trust.

2.7 Chapter Overview

Hastings (2003) asserts that commitment and trust are pivotal in developing social marketing partnerships. From an analysis of the social marketing literature, there is a stack discrepancy in the practical application of partnerships within social marketing and empirical or theoretical research to support its usage. Following the progressive shift within the discipline from a ‘transactional’ to a ‘transformational’ perspective, this chapter identified a lack of clarity pertaining to the definition of social marketing partnerships. In response to this ambiguity, eight key characteristics of social marketing partnerships were identified. These characteristics were subsequently developed into research propositions which guide the data collection this research. The next chapter will outline the three phased research methodology chosen to empirically test these research propositions.


Chapter 3 Case Study Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The three phases of this research methodology are outlined in Figure 3.1. This chapter discusses Phase Two the case study research methodology. It presents the justification for choosing a case study research methodology and describes the data collection procedures undertaken. As a key outcome of this phase of research the conceptual specification of the constructs under investigation are precisely defined ensuring the stipulation of inclusion and exclusion boundaries (Churchill 1979; Netemeyer, Bearden et al. 2003).

Figure 3.1 Overview of Research Methodology
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Before the case study is discussed, the primary and secondary objectives previously outlined on page 17 are revisited.

3.2 Objectives of this Study

3.2.1 Primary Research Objective

The primary objective of this research is to develop a social marketing partnership framework through the extension of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model (see Figure 1.4 p.16) within the social marketing domain.

3.2.2 Secondary Research Objectives

This primary objective is supported by five secondary objectives which are outlined below:

Secondary Objective 1: To identify the key milestones pertaining to the evolution of social marketing partnership development including the implications this change has on:

- The roles undertaken by participants.
- The selection and interaction processes related to social marketing partnership formation.
- The types of partnership engagement.

Secondary Objective 2: To analyse the boundaries of social marketing partnership through an examination of the different definitions and terms of reference adopted by practitioners and academics.

Secondary Objective 3: To delineate the different social marketing partnership taxonomies.

Secondary Objective 4: To determine the key antecedent variables impacting on social marketing partnerships and
Secondary Objective 5: To establish the key outcome variables of social marketing partnerships.

Realism was chosen as the research paradigm that guided the implementation of this research. The rationale for choosing a realist perspective and its ontological and epistemological assertions are discussed in the following section.

### 3.3 Realism as the Theoretical Framework

A scientist’s chosen theoretical perspective is imperative as it denotes the type of research conducted and how it will be analysed. In the past, the social science literature has been dominated by research adopting a positivist (Sobh and Perry 2006), quantitative approach (Deshpande 1983; Riege 2003). This potentially had a negative impact on the development of theory within marketing science, as researchers became preoccupied with hypothesis testing whilst the area of explanatory theories remained neglected (Deshpande 1983). Table 3.1 summaries the four dominant scientific paradigms and their ontological, epistemological and methodological realities. It also briefly highlights how each paradigm interprets the real world. Realism as the chosen perspective is highlighted in light blue.

Deshpache (1983) argues that the paradigm a researcher chooses should not be perceived as mutually exclusive. Table 3.1 shows that the scientific paradigms have different epistemological and ontological perspectives; however in many instances similarities in thought occur. For instance, both positivist and realist researchers seek to explain and predict marketing phenomena (Hunt 1992; Riege 2003; Hunt and Hansen 2010d); they also share the belief that the social and natural sciences can apply the same data collection methods (Bryman and Bell 2003). Where they differ is how they interpret phenomena that has not yet been fully understood (Riege 2003). For example, Perry and Riege et al. (1998) describe a positivist approach as being value free using the analogy of a one–way mirror to represent how they interpret data. This type of approach makes positivism an inappropriate framework when examining human interactions as circumstances underlying behaviours are not
### Table 3.1 Four Categories of Scientific Paradigms and Their Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Common Methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positivism</strong></td>
<td>Reality is real and apprehensible.</td>
<td><em>Objectivist</em> Findings true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Theory</strong></td>
<td>“Virtual” reality shaped by social, economic, ethnic, political, cultural, and gender values, crystallized over time.</td>
<td><em>Subjectivist value:</em> Mediated findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructivism</strong></td>
<td>Multiple local and specific “constructed” realities.</td>
<td><em>Subjectivist:</em> Created findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realism</strong></td>
<td>Reality is “real” but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehensible.</td>
<td><em>Modified objectivist:</em> Finding probably true.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source** (Healy and Perry 2000 p. 119)
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considered (Perry, Riege et al. 1999; Hunt and Hansen 2010d). A constructionist or critical theory perspective are also deemed unsuitable for this investigation as they believe in many realities whereas realists believe in one but accept there are difference perspectives within that reality making techniques such as triangulation important (Perry, Riege et al. 1999).

Realism was chosen to guide the model building process as it allows the researcher to evaluate whether the chosen constructs really exist. A realist believes that:-

“All knowledge claims must be critically evaluated and tested to determine the extent to which they do, or do not, truly represent or correspond to that world” (Hunt 1990 p.9).

Through their research, realists aim to generate knowledge by examining the word as it really is, believing that “correspondence between theories and realities is the central aim of science” (Hunt 2010c p.112).

Unlike their positivist counterparts, realists are not preoccupied with generalising findings to populations; instead they focus on theoretical propositions. Reflecting on the nature of social marketing and the difficulties that it is now facing as multifaceted issues grow in society, a realist acknowledges that the phenomena under investigation are complex and that the ‘actors’ under investigation make choices (Hunt 1990; Healy and Perry 2000; Sobh and Perry 2006). The context in which the phenomena exists remains important (Sobh and Perry 2006) because the world exists independently of how it is perceived. By adopting a realist perspective, the chosen research methodology intends to present a comprehension of the world as accurately as possible (Hunt 1990). It continues to question why the phenomenon exists and therefore if an event is falsified it does not necessarily mean that it has been misunderstood as the context in which it exists plays a role (Sobh and Perry 2006).

Given the complex nature of social marketing partnerships and the importance of context in interpreting reality as outlined above, a case study methodology has been chosen as the second phase of this investigation (building upon the first phase, the
literature review). The case study strategy described within this chapter outlines the processes undertaken to operationalise key constructs that will undergo further empirical testing in phase three. Adopting this approach, data is collected which evolves into law like generalisations which are tested in the final phase of this research (O’Shaughnessy 2010). An inductive approach is taken as theory will be the outcome of this research allowing for theoretical reflections of the results (Bryman and Bell 2003; O’Shaughnessy 2010). It is however argued that a purely inductive investigation would be too restrictive for this research and could impede the development of a valid social marketing partnership model (Perry 1998; Perry, Riege et al. 1999). Therefore, this investigation into the key mediating variables of social marketing partnerships benefits from prior knowledge of the literature which strengthens the conceptual argument when justifying the newly formed theory (Sutton and Staw 1995). In this circumstance Perry (1998) advocates further theory building is needed before further empirical testing can be completed. Perry (1998) also suggests that from a realist perspective this knowledge can be supported through triangulation whereby different sources of data converge to check results.

3.3.1 Ontological and Epistemological Assumptions of Realism

Realists believe in three levels of reality exist (real, actual and empirical) as illustrated in Table 3.2. This research seeks to examine these layers of reality to strengthen the understand their existence (Tsoukas 1989; Perry, Riege et al. 1999).

Table 3.2 Ontological Assumptions of Realism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Real Domain</th>
<th>Actual Domain</th>
<th>Empirical Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Perry, Riege et al. 1999 p.19)
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Perry, Riege et al. (1999) describe realism as looking through a window at reality as we perceive it to be. Through triangulation realists believe that their observations are real however not perfect (Perry, Riege et al. 1999). The idea of layers of reality deepens this perception. In Table 3.2, as explained in Perry, Riege et al. (1999), the domains are considered real and the mechanisms, events and experiences are the processes that catalyze events or observations. These three factors are said to exist independently and it is therefore the aim of a realist to observe these mechanisms, events and experiences to gain a comprehension of the real domain.

From an epistemological modified objectivist perspective, the actions taken within this research strive to maintain regularity and objectivity in the findings. Pre-existing knowledge is used to guide and confirm the research generated from phase one (Guba 1994).

With the theoretical perspective underpinning this research explained and justified, the explanatory case study is now discussed.

3.4 Explanatory Case Study Justification

A case study methodology is appropriate when investigating new topic areas, new phenomena, or if an intense examination of complex issues is necessary (Yin 1981; Bryman and Bell 2003; Yin 2009). These characteristics make it an appropriate choice for investigating social marketing partnerships; a multifaceted entity, which has previously undergone limited empirical exploration. This case study examines phenomena in a real world setting or context by observing relationships; in turn deepening the understanding of social marketing partnerships (Platt 2006).

By utilising a case study methodology as a framework to control data collection (Stoecker 2006), the research propositions as outlined (Chapter 2) are refined and transformed prior to the commencement of the final phase of investigation as advocated by Riege (2003). These research propositions are presented below:

\[ P1: \] The presence of relationship commitment and trust are central to the development of SM partnerships.
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P2: Without the presence of trust, commitment will not manifest.

P3: Mutual benefit, shared values and communication are key antecedents to SM partnership development.

P4: Motivation, tension and cooperation are outcomes of the presence of commitment and trust.

As these propositions suggest, the primary role of this single case study is theory building as opposed verification (Bonoma 1985). It is not intended to develop scientific statistical generalisations (Eisenhardt 1989; Yin 1994; Woodside and Wilson 2003; Yin 2009); instead it strives to generate theoretic propositions through analytical generalisations that will undergo further empirically testing (Yin 2009). This case study therefore has two goals. Firstly, it establishes the empirical referents necessary for hypothesis building acting as a pre-test for the key social marketing partnership constructs (Platt 2006). Secondly, it outlines the rules of interpretation for these stated hypotheses (Hunt 2010a).

The literature review (Phase one) established that the necessary empirical referents, namely operational definitions, of all key social marketing partnership constructs that will undergo empirical testing do not currently exist. The establishment of irrefutable definitions within scientific enquiry remains pivotal for the justification of observations and interpretations (Baker 1995). Without the establishment of a singular definition, terms cannot be scientifically testable, and therefore one comprehensive operational definition for each construct is vital (Hunt 2010b). Concurrently, without these definitions, the predictive type statements needed to generate research hypothesis could not be deemed meaningful or scientific (Hunt 2010b). A further prerequisite outlined in Bonoma (1985) determines that phenomenon under investigation must be described before they can be operationalised for further empirical testing. This case study responds to this definitional ambiguity through observing real world interactions and by analysing and interpreting them. This process results in the clarification of the meaning of key constructs, leading to the establishment of the operational definitions.
Chapter Three: Case Study Research Methodology

Case studies as a strategy have been criticized for lacking rigor compared to other methodologies from competing paradigms such as positivism (Yin 1994; Healy and Perry 2000; Riege 2003). The lack of boundaries implicit in the case study methodology has lead researchers to be apprehensive of adopting a strategy that has been disparaged for lacking the control found in conventional quantitative methodologies (Stoecker 2006). Although a quantitative approach would arguably increase the rigor of the research it would in turn decrease its relevance by demolishing the context in which it exists (Guba 1994). Following the assumptions of the realist paradigm, this case study seeks to present a holistic view of the development of social marketing partnerships and the constructs that positively and negatively impact on key constructs. Quantitative techniques are too restrictive meaning that valid explanations cannot always arise (Stoecker 2006). While quantitative research fulfils the criteria of theory building with its ability to predict; Stoecker (2002) suggests that by undertaking a case study a greater understanding of the constructs impacting relationships arises making these predictions more specific.

A greater comprehension of how the constructs and the relationships between them manifest will assist in explaining and predicting social marketing partnerships before a theory arises (Sutton and Staw 1995). However, operationalised or defined constructs do not equate to a theory. Following Hunt’s (2010 p.190) “Empirical Testing Process”, this case transforms the research propositions containing generalized conditionals into research hypotheses that are empirically testable (Baker 1995; Platt 2006; Hunt 2010b). Hypotheses are concise statements outlining what is expected to happen and also act as a link between theory and the empirical data (Sutton and Staw 1995). Due to the qualitative nature of the case study casual arguments cannot be presented because as Sutton and Shaw (1995) suggest, arguments cannot be made simple enough to apply to other settings. Instead inferences will be made which will assist in the development of testable hypotheses (Baker 1995).

The process of establishing operational definitions using a case study methodology also increases the intersubjective reliability for the key concepts within the model. This ensures that key terms are clearly defined increasing the likelihood that
researchers from differing disciplines can empirically test the social marketing partnership model (Hunt 2010b).

Now that the choice of case study has been justified, the next section outlines the case study protocols implemented throughout. An overview of the contents of the remainder of this chapter is provided in Figure 3.3.

Figure 3.3 Overview of Case Study Protocols

Get Your Life into Gear Case Study
Truck driver obesity social marketing pilot project

Overt Participant Observation
Data collection July 2008 – April 2010
Goal: operationalise and pre–test key SM constructs
Considerations: Maintaining objective detachment

Data Collection Procedures

Field notes & diary
Protocols established to maintain consistency of recording see Figure 3.3

Meeting agenda & minutes
All meetings were recorded researcher & approved by attendees

Correspondence
Email, telephone & postal

Validity considerations: Construct, internal, external validity, confirmability, credibility & transferability

Data Analysis
Explanation building – Compares patterns that arose from the analysis with a previously predicted one
NVIVO & manual coding
Resulting in hypothesised SM partnership model for further empirical testing
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3.5 Case Study Background

This single case study analyses *Get Your Life into Gear* (GYLG), a pilot workplace initiative which broadly sought to address the issue of male obesity on the island of Ireland (IOI). Purposeful sampling was used to select this pilot intervention as the unit of analysis. This pilot initiative, presented the unique opportunity to access and observe the key interactions and processes that take place when developing a social marketing partnership based public health initiative. This case study is set within the workplace environment, meaning it is reflective of real situations that social marketers face during each stage of developing partnerships. By analysing the dynamics of social marketing partnerships within this holistic real world perspective, contextual conditions are accounted for (Bonoma 1985; Yin 1994; Platt 2006) resulting in a greater comprehension of the key antecedents and outcomes arising from the development of social marketing partnerships (Eisenhardt 1989). This single case demonstrates that the observed phenomena do exist and therefore justifies construct selection. It is not suggested that GYLG is representative (Platt 2006) however it does assist in theory building within this domain (Eisenhardt 1989).

At this juncture the role of the GYLG initiative should be clarified. This case does not describe in detail every element of the planning, design and implementation or even the outcome of the GYLG programme; although background and context are necessary to facilitate knowledge generation. Instead, it is primarily concerned with examining the protocols undertaken to establish such a pilot project and as a result focuses on the impact these procedures have on the inter-relationships between the key partners.

To assist in a deepened comprehension of the case study context the next section presents a profile of *safefood* and their motivations for instigating this initiative as one method of addressing the complex issue of obesity.
3.5.1 Organisational Profile

`safefood`, the brand identity for the Food Safety Promotion Board, was established in 1999 as one of the North South bodies under the terms of the British-Irish Agreement Act 1999 and the North-South Co-operation (Implementation Bodies) Northern Ireland Order 1999 (safefood 2011). This government funded organisation is responsible for the communication of food safety and nutritional messages to consumers on the IOI. To maintain `safefood`’s activities the organisation is comprised of four directorates, Marketing and Communications (M&C); Food Science (FS); Human Health and Nutrition (HHN) and Corporate Operations (CO). It is a relatively small organisation employing approximately 35 full time contracted staff and five research fellows. All activities undertaken by `safefood` are approved by the North/South Ministerial Council including business plans and budget allocations.

Figure 3.3 outlines a summary of the organisational structure of `safefood`. As depicted in the figure, the Chief Executive is also guided by two committees who provide strategic and independent advice on `safefood`’s messaging and activities of engagement. The members of these committees represent various sectors ranging from scientific to the food industry (safefood 2011).

Figure 3.3 The Organisational Structure of `safefood`

![Organisational Structure of safefood](image-url)

Source: (safefood 2011)
3.5.2 Organisational Activities

As one core component of their remit, safefood are dedicated to addressing the complex issue of obesity, which is continuing to increase at a population level. Prior to 2008, the majority of safefood’s consumer focused messaging was targeted generally at the adult population on the IOI utilising mass media communications to increase awareness of the obesity epidemic. During this time safefood as an organisation lacked the resources to tackle issues from an individual perspective or at community level, and therefore were becoming more involved in stakeholder engagement and relationship development to build competencies. By consulting with outside organisations from various perspectives and sectors within the IOI and further abroad, safefood continued to co–learn and co–create knowledge whilst trying to develop solutions to the obesity issue by examining the problem from a holistic perspective.

Due to the complex nature of the obesity epidemic safefood have a history of engagement with outside organisations. safefood set up the All Island Obesity Action Forum which brings together more than 30 disparate organisations working across the island of Ireland to tackle the issue of obesity. safefood are also active participants on working groups such as the National Heart Alliance. Participation in these forums allows safefood the opportunity to inform policy and assist in the establishment of best practice approaches on the IOI through collaboration and network development.

Prior to the development of GYLG, safefood understood the importance of adopting a partnership approach and embarked on such ventures. At an IOI level targeting obesity, safefood had partnered with the Health Service Executive (HSE) in the development and implementation of Little Steps\(^2\) and with the Irish Nutrition and Dietetic Institute (INDI) on Weigh2Live\(^3\). These campaigns were launched at the same time as GYLG was being considered as an initiative. In terms of managing partnership development throughout these campaigns no best practice frameworks or

\(^2\) Little Steps (2008 – 2010) was an All island campaign tasked with addressing the issue of childhood obesity (www.littlesteps.eu)
\(^3\) Weigh2Live (2008 – present) is an online tool which offers free and independent advice and support for individuals seeking to lose weight (www.safefood.eu/weigh2live)
partnership development models were used to guide the strategic decision making processes as none existed. **safefood** had also attempted to engage in public private partnerships however, as a government funded public agency engagement with the private sector was difficult.

As the organisation continued to engage in partnerships they wanted a deeper understanding of how to pursue these types of relationships in the future, from an organisational and a problem solving perspective. GYLG presented an opportunity to adopt a best practice approach to behavioural change and learn more about the dynamics of partnership formation.

### 3.5.3 Social Marketing – an Approach to Behavioural Change

GYLG was the first pilot initiative wholly funded by **safefood** which adopted the social marketing conceptual framework. Until this point activities were guided through the adoption of the principles of health promotion and health communication. **safefood** had minimal knowledge or expertise in the area of social marketing. However, as social marketing became widely utilised within both the IOI and the United Kingdom (UK) the Director of Marketing Communications became increasingly interested in the benefits social marketing could offer the organisation.

The GYLG pilot was isolated as a topic which would be used to pilot the central tenets of social marketing. The researcher with expertise in social marketing was awarded the lead on the GYLG pilot initiative and was supported by a member of the HHN team. The researcher was asked to adopt a best practice approach to implementing a social marketing campaign consulting Andreasen’s (2006) social marketing benchmark criteria. This text provided practical guidance on how to implement an initiative within an organisation that was not familiar with the social marketing discipline.

### 3.5.4 Contextualising the Issue of Male Obesity

In 2001, 39% of adults on the IOI were classified as overweight with 18% deemed obese. Upon further analysis, a higher percentage of men were deemed overweight
or obese than their female counterparts (46% males and 33% females overweight; 20% males and 16% of females obese) (Irish Universities Nutrition Alliance 2001). In ROI, the prevalence of overweight males had increased by 3% from 1998 to 2007 (Morgan, McGee et al. 2008). The issue of male obesity is further exacerbated as compared to women, men are reportedly less concerned about their weight, use different approaches to weight management/weight loss and are less likely to use weight loss services (De Souza and Ciclitiva 2005; White, Conrad et al. 2008; Gray, Anderson et al. 2009). Men also continually fail to engage with available health services (Rumm 2005; Gough 2007); choosing to seek help indirectly (Smith, Braunack - Mayer et al. 2006) and are a notoriously hard to reach cohort through education strategies (Rumm 2005).

Obese men are thought to be at greater risk than women from developing obesity-related illness as they store the excess weight in their abdominal region (De Souza and Ciclitiva 2005; Morgan, McGee et al. 2008). They often do not realise they have a weight problem (Wardle and Johnson 2002) and view weight loss differently from females; often using health issues as a motivation for trying to lose weight (De Souza and Ciclitiva 2005). Past approaches that rely on gender neutral messages have failed to engage men and therefore campaigns needed to be reframed to reflect male specific approaches (Wilkins 2007). A more creative approach is needed for the delivery of health related messages targeted at men and their relevant consequences (Richardson 2009).

### 3.5.5 Influencers on Obesity

As reported in the unpublished GYLG (2011) evaluation, since the Ottawa Charter (1986) there has been a greater emphasis placed on examining the role of environments in relation to health (World Health Organisation 1986). The Foresight Report (2005) proposed a systems based approach to tackling complex and multifaceted problems such as obesity (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007). This systems perspective was introduced in Chapter One with a brief discussion of the Generic Map of the Contributors to the Obesity Issue (Figure 1.1 pg 6). This map identified that many interrelated factors combine to influence the development of obesity. Each category of influence encompasses a plethora of networks that are both direct
and indirect powers. This map also highlights how deeply the problem penetrates making it increasingly difficult to isolate the cause and solution to the problem (Bye 2000). As already identified in Chapter One a Total Market Approach (TMA) is needed to catalyse change across and between levels simultaneously.

Experts now believe that the obesity epidemic is largely linked to cultural and societal influences and not the sole responsibility of the individual (Deacon 2007). Shifts in social constructs such as work practices, have impacted on the dietary choices, with people striving for convenience, opting for pre-packed prepared foods that are energy dense (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007). This transformation in food preference and availability has been assisted by the increase availability of ‘ready to eat’ foods for example in fast-food counters in petrol station forecourts and an increase in access of convenience stores (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007). Making unhealthy food choices has become easier (Swinburn and Egger 2004). This change is also associated with a sedentary lifestyle that is continuing to emerge contributing to the high numbers of overweight and obese individuals. This contextualisation highlights only a small proportion of the problems facing those trying to tackle obesity; other indicators include gender and socio-economic status (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007). In response to the complexity of this issue the focus has moved away from the individual to incorporate the wider social setting.

It is evident that many factors motivate food choice with the emergence of micro-environments such as school, workplace and home settings as well as wider macro-environments such as the food industry, governments as well as society attitudes and beliefs (Swinburn and Egger 2004; Deacon 2007). This makes influencing eating behaviours difficult as health is not always the main reason for purchase or consumption (Fleming, Kelleher et al. 1997). This understanding reemphasises the differing types of stakeholders that need to engage to address the issue, a comprehension that became fundamental to the GYLG pilot.

3.5.6 Adopting a Settings Workplace Based Approach

One method of engaging different stakeholders is through the adoption of a settings based approach. The workplace has been recommended as an important
environment for facilitating effective behavioural change (World Health Organisation 1986; World Health Organisation 1997; World Health Organisation 2005). Those in employment are thought to spend a third of their lives at work, a factor that can also impact on leisure time (Deacon 2007). This setting can have an influence on physical activity patterns of employees; as well as eating behaviours as at least one meal is often consumed there (Fleming, Kelleher et al. 1997) giving the workplace the potential to improve health (Brownwell, Cohen et al. 2004). This environment also has the advantage of reinforcing the adoption of weight gain prevention messages and positive lifestyle behaviours (Kwak, Kremers et al. 2006).

As well as these influencers, a multi-level approach should be adopted so that individual, organisational and community-level and population strategies work in tandem (Wilson, Holman et al. 1996). Change must be adopted by individual and environment simultaneously (Makrides, Heath et al. 2006). Reflecting on the systems based approach advocated in the Foresight Report (2005) (Figure 3.5), programme planners were aware that this pilot would not solve this wicked problem. However by developing a social marketing partnership at this scale it could examine multiple layers of the system with the overall learnings penetrating at a richer level.

This contextualisation of the obesity issue on the IOI identifies the need for innovation when trying to tackle such wicked problems. It has shown that there are many points of contact with the consumer however direct and indirect factors impact on their decision-making processes.

3.6 Introduction to the Get Your Life in Gear Pilot Project

Prior to the development of the pilot campaign and commissioning specific research on the chosen target citizen, a situational analysis was completed which broadly profiled the current condition regarding men’s health on the IOI. As part of this scoping out stage influential individuals and organisations that had targeted or worked with men on various health related campaigns were contacted by safefood staff via telephone and/or email. Once contacted, they were asked for advice on how to engage men with their weight/health and the strengths and weaknesses of their activities. This search helped identify the type of initiative that needed to be
implemented; assess the resources and expertise available within the safefood organisation and the potential partners who could add value to this project.

3.6.1 Segmenting the Male Population

Generically targeting the male population on the IOI was deemed too broad for this project and therefore numerous workforces were profiled (for example: postal workers and bin collectors) and assessed for suitability for facilitating behavioural change (Duane and Domegan 2012). Initially, the construction industry was identified as the prospective workforce for this pilot. However, this decision was reversed as during the economic downturn on the IOI it became less feasible to successfully target individuals in this occupation due to mass unemployment. Following formative research, professional truck drivers on the IOI were selected as the target citizen by safefood because as a workforce, they had been largely neglected in the past in terms of healthy eating and physical activity interventions.

3.6.2 Truck Driver Health

Little research has been conducted on truck driver health on the IOI; however, research conducted internationally has identified common characteristics. Truck drivers are known to be a high-risk group, characterised by poor eating habits due to constant snacking and irregular meal patterns. They eat at times that are convenient to them and find it difficult to bring a packed lunch to work (Jack, Piacentini et al. 1998), instead consuming what is available when in transit (Whitefield Jacobson, Prawitz et al. 2007). Driver’s live solitary lifestyles working in isolation, with irregular and erratic shift patterns, exhibiting sedentary behaviours as they lack opportunities to exercise. In combination, all these factors make them a harder to reach group (Jack, Piacentini et al. 1998; Gill and Wijk 2004; Krugar, Brewster et al. 2007; Whitefield Jacobson, Prawitz et al. 2007). These characteristics illustrate that there are many interrelated influencers on the health status of drivers which impact on their weight resulting in the broadening of the stakeholder grouping and partnership selection pool (Duane and Domegan 2010; Duane and Domegan 2012).
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The creation of value exchanges (i.e. highlighting the benefits of the proposed change over the consequences of not adopting the proposed change) with the target audience was key in developing the GYLG pilot initiative, meaning that an in-depth understanding of the barriers and precursors of change were identified and used to inform development. This social marketing approach moved the drivers forward from intending to change their unhealthy lifestyles to making actual voluntary changes which was central to its success. The pilot initiative was designed to be flexible so it could be implemented in the diverse situations the drivers experienced on a daily basis. To understand these prevailing issues formative research with this target group consisting of 14 in-depth interviews with truck drivers in a distribution depot in Northern Ireland and eight focus groups across the IOI were utilised as part of a needs assessment. This formative research was conducted by a market research agency on behalf of safefood. The background and overall results of this formative research is presented in Appendix A.

Based on the profile of the drivers (e.g. middle-aged men) and the results of the formative research a number of project objectives were developed relating to address these needs.

Operationally ‘Get Your Life in Gear’ aimed to:-

1. Increase truck driver’s physical activity levels to at least 30 minutes per day 5 days per week by the end of the 12 weeks.
2. Reduce truck driver’s consumption of fatty and sugary foods (and drinks) by 10% over the course of the 12 weeks.
3. Increase truck driver’s fruit and vegetable consumption by at least one portion per day over the 12 weeks.
4. Maintain a healthy weight in truck drivers and/or reduce weight by 10% in truck drivers with a BMI over 25.

As discussed in Chapter 2 best practice approaches to addressing wicked problems call for a multifaceted approach to behavioural change which resulted in a partnership approach to this campaign (Roberts 2000). Figure 3.4 presents an overview of the GYLG pilot initiative that was designed to meet these operational objectives.
Figure 3.4 Get Your Life in Gear Pilot Initiative Overview

### Company 1 NI (PS1)
#### Consultation with management
- Material Testing
- Briefed in point of contact
- Letter to those who participated in formative research

#### Health checks
- 05-06 October (6am-12noon), pilot site depot
- Mgt-facilitated appointments/drop in
- NICHS Nurses (2)
- Recruiters (2-3)
- Participants (17)

#### Follow – up health checks
- See PS2
- 04 March (6am-12 noon)
- NICHS Nurse (1)
- Recruiter (1)
- Participants (1)

### Get Your Life into Gear Pilot
#### Recruitment
- two weeks pre-launch
- Recruitment poster
- Recruitment leaflet

#### Programme launch: on-site recruitment
- Lifestyle Questionnaire
- 30 minute health check
- (weight, height, BMI, blood pressure, cholesterol and glucose)
- Lifestyle advice
- Introduction to programme – explanation of toolbox contents and programme execution

#### Maintenance
Motivational messaging via text message every week & motivational posters around the depot/service stations (sign up: 3/65 in NI 15/15 ROI)

#### After 6 weeks
Letter to motivate participants and remind them about 12 week health check

#### After 12 weeks
Health check & advice; 2nd lifestyle questionnaire

### Service Stations – 2 (1 NI & 1 ROI)
#### NI (PS2)
- Material testing

#### ROI (PS3)
- Dietician assessment of food availability
- Recommendations

#### Health checks
- 07-09 Oct (7am-3pm)
- Service station forecourt
- NICHS Nurses (2)
- Recruiters (2-3)
- Drop-in basis
- Participants (48)

#### Follow – up health checks
- 13-15 Jan 2010 7-3pm)
- Service station forecourt
- NICHS Nurse (2)
- Recruiter (2)
- Participants (13)

Source: (safefood 2011)
3.7 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Data collection for this case study commenced in July 2008 and was completed in April 2010 encompassing almost two and half years. During this time the economic climate deteriorated on the IOI therefore the budget for the project had been significantly reduced which had implications for its scale from a national to a regional initiative. This section identifies the protocols for data collection and outlines the inclusion and exclusion boundaries for recording observations as well as the steps taken to maintain the validity and reliability of results.

To increase the transparency of the case study in the first instance, the role of the researcher is clarified due to the implications it has on the data collected.

3.7.1 The Role of the Researcher

Throughout the duration of the project the researcher had a number of roles which impacted on the decision making processes during data collection. A summary of these roles are provided in Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.5 The Role of the Researcher
3.7.1.1 *safefood* Research Fellow

The researcher was recruited through the National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG) and placed within the M&C directorate in *safefood*’s Dublin office from 9am–5pm Monday–Friday between July 2008 and July 2011. As part of this Research Fellowship the researcher was responsible for coordinating the GYLG social marketing project; advising on behavioural change strategies and communication; supporting the web editorial team and managing the organisations market research as well as other ad hoc projects that materialized. Therefore the observations documented within this case study are reflective of reality whereby employees often work on multiple projects in tandem.

Although accepted as a member of the M&C directorate, from an employment perspective the Fellow was under contractual agreement with the National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG) and therefore certain conditions available to direct employees such as flexi–time, overtime and continued personal development training were not available to the researcher. Once outside the office the researcher was viewed as an ambassador and employee for *safefood* with the exception of NUIG academic events. For instance, introductions usually began with “Hello my name is Sinead Duane, I am a Research Fellow in the M&C department at *safefood* specializing in the area of social marketing and research…” where appropriate the researcher would also include that she was conducting PhD research in relation to social marketing partnership development through NUIG.

### 3.7.1.2 National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG) PhD Student

Throughout the researcher’s duration at *safefood*, staff members within the organisation were made aware that the researcher was engaged in the PhD process and utilizing the GYLG pilot initiative as a unit of analysis. During the induction at *safefood* with senior management and NUIG supervisor, social marketing partnership development was outlined as a topic of interest from both an organisational and research perspective and therefore gained much internal top level support. As an area of great interest within *safefood* this topic provided the
researcher with the much needed access to gather the data and the opportunity to make both theoretical and practical contributions.

### 3.7.2 Participant Observation

This clarification of the role positions the researcher as a participant observer, whereby the person actively participates as opposed to passively observing interactions (Gold 1958; Yin 2009). It can be argued that it is not possible to study the social world without becoming part of it, moving beyond the passive to the active observer (Tedlock 2000). Through observation as a participant, the researcher has the advantage of investigating social marketing partnerships within the mediums, symbols and experiences of the public health setting (Vidich 1969). Gold’s (1958) classification of the role of the participant and observer positions the researcher’s participation along a continuum ranging from involved to detachment (i.e. complete participant to complete observer). Based on this classification, Bryman and Bell (2003) suggests that the researcher undertakes an overt approach to investigation whereby those within the social setting are aware that they are being observed. Referring back to the role of the researcher, by adopting the identity of a professional within a meaningful role in the organisation, the researcher undertakes the difficult task of balancing emotional involvement with objective detachment or an emic and etic approach (Morris, Leung et al. 1999; Tedlock 2000).

The role as an overt researcher was quickly established within safefood, as the nature of the organisation, meant the researcher worked on multiple projects at any given time. From their experience working as ethnographers Angrosino and Mays de Pays (2000) suggest that over time the ‘novelty’ of the researcher’s presence, which was initially disruptive, can become accepted as the institutional identity it established. Through engaging in the day to day running of the office, rapport was established without going ‘native’ with the role of the researcher growing with the process (Angrosino and Mays de Perez 2000).

A more difficult task was to maintain the objective detachment within safefood needed to remain extrinsic to the setting. In the pursuit of this role and with safefood’s management’s consent, the researcher was allocated one to two days a
week to dedicate to the research alone. This detachment was symbolised by removing oneself from the open plan desk surrounded by other employees to a secluded room removed from routine activities, with no access to work emails or telephone. The boundaries of this detachment however, were blurred in busy periods for example, before the launch of a campaign when the researcher could not be allocated this ‘free time’ due to resourcing issues.

At scheduled times during the year the researcher also travelled to NUIG to attend research related meetings which were clearly marked in an open access diary on the organisation’s intranet. These subtle reminders assisted in maintaining the overtness of the research. Without the opportunity to observe through participation within the GYLG case, the researcher would not have had access to witness the dynamics of social marketing partnerships or the Key Mediating Variables (KMV) that facilitated it, therefore the value of participation outweighed its limitations, such as the long time spent needed to collect data.

3.8 Primary Data Collection Methods

Three dominant sources of evidence were collected during the data collection process. These included observations, meeting minutes and agendas and correspondence in different formats. In total, 22 meeting of minutes were analysed (internal, external, pilot site and stakeholder), as well as two written letters, over 100 emails and over 100 diary entries and field notes of observation. Additionally two Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) drafted for the pilot initiative were also included. A summary of these sources of data are provided in Table 3.3.

3.8.1 Observations

This research was a fluid process and therefore all interactions could not be planned. A full record of observations were kept to further counteract any erosion of objectivity through the discrepancy between the role of the participant versus observer (Yin 2009). Table 3.3 highlights that there were opportunities to observe the partnership in a planned fashion, for example, at scheduled meetings. However, at other times such as ad hoc encounters the researcher was reliant on their diary and
email communication. Adapting the guidelines suggested by Silverman (2006) the research utilised three methods to record observations:

- Brief notes taken at the time of observation – these notes could include the notes from meetings and/or telephone conversations with those involved.
- Expanded field notes as soon as possible after each meeting.
- A diary of the main issues that impacted on the study.

These guidelines assisted in adding structure to the manner in which observations were recorded. Table 3.3 includes both descriptive and analytical elements relating to observations or field notes. An outline of the formal structure undertaken for these field notes is included in Table 3.4. Within the office environment it became difficult to reflect on observations as they happened therefore, analytical or reflective notes were completed outside the boundaries of the research in the domain of the researcher’s home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of communication: Telephone [ ] Email [ ] Meeting [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of interaction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiated contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled [ ] Unscheduled [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall description (purpose/aim of the encounter, level of interaction, outcome)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Structure of Field Notes

Analytical Questions:

How did the participants manage their identities? (i.e. as a partner or individual organisation?/ How did their actions impact on the partnership processes? / How did the management of the partnership impact on the actions taken?

A number of issues constrained the digital recording of events during the fieldwork. safefood as an organization did not allow digital recording of other employees without prior consent or knowledge. As an overt participant observer it would have
Table 3.3 Summary of Case Study Sources of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>The researcher kept multiple forms of notes during the project; including a diary as well as field notes. These field notes comprised of additional observations relating to meetings which could not be recorded in the official minutes from the meetings. For example, in some instances the external meetings lasted three hours therefore to keep the minutes clear and concise the observations were condensed to make the information more manageable. The diary included reflections on the experiences and interactions throughout the project including positive and negative aspects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Meeting agendas and minutes | *Minutes* - During each ‘official’ (i.e. planned) meeting with internal* and/or external** partners, and stakeholders at least one person was appointed as minute taker. At the end of the meeting these notes were transcribed into minutes which documented the central discussions within the meeting. The minutes were verified as a true representation of events by the two project leaders and hence circulated via email to the meeting participants where they were further verified. Amendments were made upon request of participants and re-circulated to the team.  
Agendas- document the proposed topics of discussion within the meetings. These were managed by the safefood planning team who invited partners to add items for discussion prior to the meeting.  
*Internal minutes* – referred to planning meetings held between the safefood *Get Your Life in Gear* working group. These meetings were held throughout the planning and development of the programme.  
**External minutes** – Comprised of minutes from the steering group, these meetings were chaired by the Chief Executive of safefood. Other external meetings were also documented, these meetings included discussions with site managers and health check professionals. |
| Correspondence – email, telephone and letter | Throughout the pilot initiative the partners utilised three modes of communication; email, telephone and letter.  
During this project email was the most dominant form of communication with over 100 emails subject to analysis.  
Two letters were sent (including invitations) and were seen as a more formal means of communication.  
Planned as well as sporadic telephone conversations arose throughout the project. As a result of the unplanned nature of some of these calls no digital recordings of the telephone conversations were made however in most instances written records were kept. Exceptions referred sporadic and shorter conversations, for example confirming attendance at meetings or requesting directions. |
taken longer for the researcher to be accepted in the environment if a recording device was present at all times and the sheer volume of data collected over the two and a half years would have been difficult to manage.

To assist in the management of the data collection after a number of months in the field the research area was refined resulting in a primary focus on the process of partnership development and maintenance. This decision was made by assessing the needs of safefood as an organisation; guidance from the social marketing literature regarding the level of knowledge relating to social marketing partnerships and a greater comprehension of what the GYLG pilot initiative would entail which helped assert the boundaries of the research.

The other primary sources of case study data, which were utilised during data collection included:

1. Agendas and minutes from meetings relating to the GYLG pilot.
2. Correspondence between initiative partners including letter, email and telephone communication.

These sources of evidence were chosen as they were reflective of the mechanisms utilised to develop partnerships in the real world settings. Meetings were utilised as a structured means of discussing the intervention and whilst also facilitating face-to-face interactions. Also, email and telephone conversations dominated as the mechanism to manage and maintain the partnership working.

3.8.2 Agendas and Minutes from Meetings Relating to the GYLG Pilot

Throughout the planning an implementation of the GYLG pilot initiative meetings were scheduled with various members of the project and included both internal and external partners. A timeline of these planned meeting is shown in Table 3.5.
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3.8.2.1 Internal Meetings and Minutes

This timeline indicates that meetings with internal group meetings were scheduled on a bi–weekly basis. These meetings lasted approximately 30 minutes and were relatively easy to arrange due to access to each other’s diaries, they could also be rearranged if a time conflict occurred without much disruption. These meetings were attended by the project leaders, senior directors from M&C and HHN; as well as representatives from their respective teams. As this project progressed over a two years period personnel attending these meetings did fluctuate and some members were replaced. Prior to meetings an agenda was circulated and attendees were given the opportunity to add topics to this agenda. One example of an agenda is provided in Appendix B. Minutes were also hand written by the two project leaders during the meeting. At the end of each meeting these notes were compared either face to face or through telephone conversations and formal minutes were produced which were circulated within 48 hours after each meeting. To ensure that the minutes were clear and concise, the discussions within the meetings were prioritised and coded usually reflecting the meeting’s agenda. These major areas of dialogue were recorded as bullet points with supporting information also provided. Attendees were emailed the minutes and senior Directors approved them as records of true events. Amendments were made upon request.

A similar procedure was adopted for recording the external meetings. The steering group were sent an agenda prior to the meeting and could add items if they desired. Usually one or two of the lead researchers took independent notes during these meetings. As these meetings were face to face and often lasted up to three hours, the project leaders met directly afterwards to discuss their notes, observations and any arising issues. These notes were then translated into manageable minutes from the meeting and were sent to the Chief Executive (who acted as Chair Person). Any further suggested amendments were made and the minutes were circulated to the external team via email within one week. Members were invited to make amendments if deemed necessary.
### Table 3.5 Summary Timeline of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Meetings</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Misc Meetings</td>
<td>Internal Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Internal Meetings</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Misc Meetings</td>
<td>Internal Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>26th – 7th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd – Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.S 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13th – Teleconf with truck driving assoc NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>19th – 8th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd – Meeting with External partner (NI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd – Meeting with External partner (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>25th – 10th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7th – P.S. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>30th – 2nd Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>19th – 3rd Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>12th – 4th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>21st – 5th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>24th – 6th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.3 Correspondence Between Get Your Life into Gear Partners

Correspondence between GYLG partners took multiple forms such as letter, email and telephone. Email dominated as the primary form of communication between external partners. However, at least two partners did not readily access their emails therefore telephone conversations were utilised with them. This made it difficult to document accurate descriptions of the conversations as they were not digitally recorded. On a number of occasions times when the researcher contacted the site managers they were engaged in other activities and therefore would return the call at their convenience. This resulted in the communications becoming sporadic and therefore the researcher had to rely on notes written after the call to document the interactions. Non-relevant ad hoc conversations were not recorded for example asking directions to the office or sending apologies for missing meetings.

On a number of occasions letters were sent to partners symbolic of a more formal line of communication. For example invitations to participate in the project or if a difficulty arose, at all times these letters were sent by more senior staff either the Chief Executive or M&C Director not the project leaders.

3.9 Case Study Analytical Framework

One of the key characteristics of the realist paradigm is rigourous analytical procedures (Riege 2003). This section outlines the case study data analysis procedures that were undertaken within this research including a brief introduction of the Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis software (CAQDAS) that was utilised to support this investigation. Consequently the coding procedures undertaken to assist in the analysis will also be outlined.

3.9.1 Triangulation

To overcome concerns relating to the validity of the field notes, and to contribute to the accuracy of the analysis, triangulation was employed. This procedure ensured that multiple perceptions of reality converged and therefore clarified the meaning
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relating to the findings as well as confirming that the phenomenon did exist (Stake 2000; Ghauri and Gronhaug 2010). Triangulation also enhanced construct validity through avoiding subjective judgements during data collection and through this objectivity a more accurate portrayal of events was achieved (Silverman 2006). It also allowed for the examination of the differences between the sources of data, and resulted in a valued contribution to the findings of the case study findings.

Triangulation occurred before the data was completely analysed. After reading through the transcripts from the different data sources (See Table 3.3) themes were coded for example trust and commitment. Once this process was finished the convergence between the themes emerging from the different data sources were assessed.

3.9.2 Explanation Building

Explanation building is suggested by Yin (2009) as a suitable analytical framework when investigating explanatory cases. It can be described as a specific type of Pattern Matching. This strategy compares the data collected with the previously formalised research propositions as an hypothesis generating exercise (Yin 2009). Following realism as the theoretical paradigm guiding this research, explanation building allowed the researcher to investigate proposed causal links which could be difficult to measure. In this case study, a converging pattern suggested that the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships do exist and reinforce the internal validity of results. Based on the findings of this analysis the propositions can be modified (Hyde 2000).

3.9.3 Coding Procedures

Before triangulation commenced the qualitative data needed to be coded. Throughout this process the codes were not counted, as the converging causation was more relevant, instead a link was established between the codes and the original text. This procedure ensures that the original text was maintained (Gibbs 2002) and that interrelated ideas were observed (Bryman and Bell 2003). Both manual coding and CADQAS were employed however the coding procedures remained the same.
Manual coding was implemented for the handwritten observations that were taken throughout the case. Where appropriate, to increase the proficiency of the coding process NVIVO 9 assisted in the analysis of the qualitative data by improving efficiency of data management (Bryman and Bell 2003; Bazeley 2007). This software package cannot conduct the analysis on behalf of the researcher however it can assist in conceptualizing categories and maintaining cohesion as the data is stored in one place and multiple texts can be assigned to the same codes (Weitzman 2000). The sources of data were imported into NVIVO and categorized according to the type of observation as cited in Table 3.4. Figure 3.9 shows an example of the sources imported into NVIVO.

During the analysis process within NVIVO ‘Nodes’ were created which allowed the researcher to identify themes within the text and code them accordingly. The nine parent nodes specified within this research reflected three antecedents and three outcomes arising from the literature. As mediating variables trust and commitment were also selected as a parent node. Expectation of continuance was the last parent code selected as it was deemed a more appropriate node then motivation. Multiple codes can be assigned to the same text as shown in Figure 3.6.

Figure 3.6 An Example of Sources Inputted into NVIVO
During the iterative analysis process within the parent nodes, numerous child nodes were evident, with numbers varying depending on the construct being examined. For example, at the beginning of the analysis process the researcher identified communication as a parent node. After subsequent analysis, communication across and between levels of the partnership were identified as a sub theme within communication. Additionally, formality, expectations and frequency were also determined to be child nodes of communication.

Ten were established as a result of the literature search. Once all the data had been read and coded ‘within’ and ‘inter’ group similarities and differences between the nodes were identified (Eisenhardt 1989). These nodes assisted in establishing a relationship between the secondary data and the findings of the case ensuring that internal validity and transferability were enhanced through a greater comprehension of the issues (Eisenhardt 1989; Riege 2003).

Once the case study analysis was complete the four research propositions were transformed into eight research hypotheses for the next phase of the research.

3.10 Validity and Reliability

The aim of the case study was to assist in the operationalising and pre–testing of social marketing partnership constructs. Characteristic of this approach the
researcher examined real life phenomena for a deeper meaning and explanation (Riege 2003). An important part of this process was to reduce the biases that may occur, for example, from acting as participant and observer; to reduce the conclusions that are inferred and the problems associated with anecdotalism (Wilson 2004). This section examines the procedures that were followed to ensure that data collection and analysis was as rigorous as possible.

The criteria used to judge the quality of quantitative research is often argued to be defunct in the qualitative domain due to the fluid nature of its application (Mason 2002). However, debate is ongoing as to whether criteria applied to the quantitative sciences can be transferred to those adopting more qualitative techniques (Malterud 2001). Although difficult to articulate, there are some validity and reliability measures that can be implemented when undertaking a case study methodology which can corroborate rigor (Yin 1994; Yin 2009). Riege (2003) and Yin (2009) suggest four categories which contribute to maintaining the intended standards for scientific enquiry and theory building. These measures are construct, internal and external validity and reliability. Both authors advocate further design tests which are a feature of qualitative and a realist perspective comprising of trustworthiness, credibility, confirmability and data dependability (Riege 2003; Yin 2009), all of which were used in GYLG are now discussed.

3.10.1 Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to establishing accurate ‘operational measures’ for the constructs being observed, an area that has proved difficult in the past within case study methodologies (Yin 2009). Through maintaining construct validity, within this case study, the primary aim of defining and operationalising key constructs for further empirical testing was achieved and resulted in a strengthen theory (Eisenhardt 1989). Eisenhardt (1989) purports that by maintaining construct validity and examining the relationships between constructs, a verification process takes place similar to that of testing research hypothesis. By confirming or disconfirming the research propositions which were developed at the beginning of the case study the findings act as a valuable justification process for choosing constructs which are operationalised and included in the proposed social marketing partnership model for
further empirical testing. This case therefore acts as a useful medium for developing research hypotheses that will be empirically tested (Platt 2006).

To assert boundaries for this case study and improve the accuracy and dependability of the observations, the constructs arising from the social marketing partnership literature were specified prior to investigation therefore increasing the empirical power underlying the key findings (Eisenhardt 1989). These key constructs are Trust, Commitment, Shared Values, Mutual Benefit, Communication, Motivation, Cooperation and Tension. Realists enter the field with knowledge generated from prior theories that are reflective of the external realities that may have undergone investigation previously (Sobh and Perry 2006). It should be noted that these constructs are not guaranteed or assumed to be supported and should new constructs arise they could be included in the proposed model. These constructs are also apparent in the research propositions that were developed to guide the research.

To ensure that construct validity was maintained throughout this research a number of procedures were relied upon. Firstly, multiple sources of data were utilised during the analysis of this case study. These sources as described in section 3.8 ensured that the data was triangulated before the findings were presented. By adopting this converging line of enquiry and maintaining a chain of evidence subjective judgments were peer reviewed. To further collaborate the findings, two key informants were asked to read the final analysis to ensure that the findings were justified as advocated by Riege (2003) and Silverman (2006). Both of the individuals were employees at safefood who worked on the GYLG intervention. It was important for this collaboration to take place to ensure that the case represented the true account of events.

### 3.10.2 Confirmability

Confirmability corresponds with construct validity and as such is concerned with how the data has been interpreted and the line of enquiry undertaken to ensure that the results are not subject to prejudice. As with construct validity, the triangulation examined the convergence between the multiple sources of data. One of the methods
for removing bias from the findings was by including quotations to support arguments (Riege 2003).

### 3.10.3 Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to ensuring confidence in the findings of the case study within the real world setting. Explanation building as the chosen analysis technique addressed problems arising with making inferences through the examination of similarities and differences arising from the observations (Riege 2003).

### 3.10.4 Credibility

A further test linked with internal validity is the credibility of findings. From this perspective the researcher examined the coherence of interpretation and the systematic procedures adopted to determine results. As with construct validity, credibility was maintained through the adoption of techniques such as triangulation and peer review from those who participated in the case study.

### 3.10.5 External Validity

External validity refers to whether the results from the case can be generalised to other settings (Yin 2009). This test has caused controversy for researchers undertaking case study analysis as external validity is difficult to measure and a limitation of the strategy particularly when utilising a single case approach (Stoecker 2006; Yin 2009). In this regard it should be reiterated that the objective of this case study was to establish analytical, not statistical generalisations. To increase the credibility and external validity of results where possible, multiple researchers were used to corroborate results and therefore improve the confidence in the findings (Eisenhardt 1989; Riege 2003). For example when minutes of meetings were documented two of the lead project workers (one being the researcher) used their own notes independently to recall the discussions within the meetings. The key outcomes from the meeting were then amalgamated to generate minutes. This document was then circulated to those involved in the meeting for approval and to
ensure that they reflected true events; changes were made if necessary. This protocol was followed to maintain the accuracy of the sources of evidence (Eisenhardt 1989).

Wilson (2004) also argues that through the examination of a problem within a natural setting, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the data available, which in turn increasing the quality of the results.

3.10.6 Transferability

To ensure the transferability of procedures the case study protocol has been described in detail within this chapter including the specific procedures undertaken when coding and analysing the data. This chapter also contained thick descriptions of the background to the study contributing to the analytical generalisations (Riege 2003).

3.10.7 Reliability

To increase the reliability of results it was imperative that the procedures undertaken were carefully documented. This measure assisted in relieving the concerns of those who find the reliability within qualitative research difficult as the researcher is asked to remove judgments they may be predisposed to (Wilson 2004). The case study protocols that were described within this chapter enhance the thick descriptions provided through analysis and therefore reduce any bias that may arise (Riege 2003; Silverman 2006). This rigorous stipulation of protocols assist in the removal of biased judgments from the process (Wilson 2004) and identify the aspects of the data collection that could be repeated (Riege 2003).

3.10.8 Dependability

Similarly to reliability dependability is concerned with stability and consistency of the research process. It ensures that there is a correlation between the stated aim and propositions and the data collection methods undertaken. It is essentially concerned the accuracy of recording observations which have been described in the preceding accounts (Riege 2003).
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3.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the protocols that were used to guide a single explanatory case study. The purpose of this phase (phase two) of the research was to pre-test the social marketing partnership constructs arising from the literature whilst also operationalising these constructs for further empirical testing.

By adopting realism as the theoretical framework to guide this research, the researcher was able to evaluate whether the social marketing constructs outlined within this chapter did exist in a given context. Get Your Life into Gear, a pilot social marketing initiative on the IOI was selected as an appropriate case study. This pilot initiative adopted a partnership approach to address the complex issue of obesity in truck drivers on the IOI. Through this case study analysis a comprehensive understanding of the social marketing partnership interaction processes could be achieved.

To guide the data collection and ensure that intersubjective reliability was achieved a detailed discussion of the case study protocols was described within this chapter. During data collection, the researcher assumed two roles, a research fellow who project managed the pilot initiative within safefood the funding organization for this research and a PhD researcher. Therefore to minimize bias during the data collection, the researcher analysed three primary sources of data; observations in the manner of field notes and diary; agendas and minutes of the meetings directly related to the initiative and correspondence in the form of letters and emails. These sources were triangulated and subsequently analysed using explanation building which compares the findings to the previous stated research positions.
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Findings

4.1 Introduction

This single case study represents an in-depth analysis of the process of developing social marketing partnerships within the context of the Get Your Life into Gear (GYLG) social marketing pilot initiative. Figure 4.1 presents overview of the findings discussed within this chapter.

4.2 Research Propositions

To address the primary objective for this research (see 3.2), which was to develop a social marketing partnership framework, the purpose of this case study was to define and operationalise the key social marketing partnership constructs that were evident within the case study. As previously discussed (see section 3.4), four research propositions were devised from an analysis of the literature review to guide this case study. These research propositions are reiterated below:

P1: The presence of relationship commitment and trust are central to the development of social marketing partnerships.

P2: Without the presence of trust, commitment will not manifest.

P3: Mutual benefit, shared values and communication are key antecedents to social marketing partnership development.

P4: Motivation, tension and cooperation are considered outcomes of the presence of commitment and/or trust.

This chapter will begin by examining safefood’s interpretation of partnerships and these research propositions.
### 4.1 Introduction

Reiteration of the four research propositions that guided the data collection of the case study.

### 4.2 Research Propositions

- SafeFood's comprehension of partnerships is discussed.

### 4.3 Delineation of Social Marketing Partnerships

- Four categories of partner were identified:
  - Supplier Partners
  - Internal Partners
  - External Advisory Group
  - Campaign Implementation Partners

### 4.4 Partnership Selection Process

- The key characteristics of three implementation partners were discussed referred to as Pilot Site A, Pilot Site B and Pilot Site C.

### 4.5 External Advisory Group

- Discusses the key characteristic of this category of partnership.

### 4.6 Campaign Implementation Partners

- The key characteristics of three implementation partners were discussed referred to as Pilot Site A, Pilot Site B and Pilot Site C.

### 4.7 Summary of Key Characteristics of Social Marketing Partnerships

- The definitions of the key social marketing partnership constructs arising from the case study are discussed:
  - Relationship Commitment
  - Trust
  - Mutual Benefit
  - Shared Values
  - Communication
  - Expectation of Continuance
  - Cooperation
  - Motivation

### 4.8 Summary
4.3 Delineation of Social Marketing Partnerships

Since the formation of safefood in 1998, the organisation has continued to build strategic partnerships with key stakeholders in areas directly and indirectly related to nutrition and food safety (for example research centres, NPOs and schools). As described in section 3.5.2, as experts in their field, safefood adopts what they perceive as a best practice approach to tackling complex issues such as obesity. In doing so, tasks such as surveillance of the obesogenic environment on the island of Ireland (IOI); stakeholder engagement, partnership development and consumer research into obesity related issues are common practice and an important aspect of their organisational ethos.

This case study focuses on one aspect of safefood’s activities, partnership development. Prior to the analysis of the social marketing partnership processes undertaken within the GYLG pilot initiative, safefood’s general understanding of partnership development is pertinent to this case study. As one of the North South bodies, safefood was established to promote cooperation between Northern Ireland (NI) and the Republic of Ireland (ROI). Therefore partnership formation is a necessary component of safefood’s activities. This understanding adds context to their motivations for facilitating the GYLG pilot initiative, as well as providing an insight into the managerial role safefood undertook throughout the partnership process.

safefood’s commitment to the adoption of partnership strategies is suggested in the following extract published on the organisations website:-

“Over the past three years safefood has developed key partnerships and collaborations with nutrition stakeholders on the island of Ireland. safefood will continue to adopt a complementary and collaborative approach in the area” (safefood 2011).

This example specifically refers to safefood’s activities within their Human Health and Nutrition (HHN) directorate and identifies a willingness to build key partnerships and collaborations with stakeholders to support activities. The term
‘complementary’ further reinforces *safefood*’s willingness to support areas of work in common with their own whilst avoiding the duplication of effort. From this excerpt alone, partnerships are characterised as having a more sophisticated relationship than stakeholder relationships; an assertion supported within the social marketing literature (French 2010). However, by referring to ‘partnerships’ and ‘collaborations’ within the same sentence to describe their relationship with stakeholders; like many of the published articles discussed in Chapter Two section 2.3 ambiguities surrounding the scope of social marketing partnerships is reintroduced. The differentiation between the two terms is interpreted as subjective.

Analysing this ambiguity within the context of this case study, the difficulty of comprehending these terms of references is further compounded. For instance, the drafted Memorandum of Understanding between partners within this pilot initiative utilises the same terms interchangeably to clarify the expectations of the relationship.

“It is agreed that *safefood* and [Insert Partners Name] will work collaboratively on the Get Your Life into Gear pilot...

*safefood* and [Insert Partners Name] will meet as necessary, to discuss the project.

The following activities will form the basis of the partnership:…”

(Extract from a draft Memorandum of Understanding 14/08/2009).

In this instance, ‘collaboration’ and ‘partnership’ are explicitly shown to share similar meanings. Examining one episode cannot identify the full connotations of the interchangeable use of such terms. Therefore, to enrich the discussion of the definition of social marketing partnerships, the next section will analyse the partnership selection process undertaken within the GYLG pilot initiative. By determining how and why certain partners were selected, the boundaries of the term become more transparent therefore conceptualising the definition of social marketing partnerships.
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4.4 The Partnership Selection Process

*safe*food* as the sole funding organisation and instigator of the GYLG pilot initiative assumed the role of managing the social marketing partnership selection process. To assist in the design and implementation of the pilot initiative four distinct partnership categories were formed. Firstly, an internal cross directorate working group was established within *safe*food* to manage the pilot initiative. Secondly, Supplier partners were commissioned to assist in operationalising it. Thirdly, the external advisory group were concerned with strategy development and decision making within the GYLG pilot initiative. The final partnership category discussed were primarily tasked with operationalising the pilot initiative, this category is referred to as the campaign implementation partners. The roles within these categories were not deemed mutually exclusive; at least one organisation was a member of both the external advisory group and campaign implementation partner categories. The implications of the roles undertaken within each category will be discussed throughout this chapter, however regardless of the type of partner; the first steps in the partnership selection process remain the same. Therefore, the first half of this section will describe the initial stages of selecting social marketing partners for the GYLG pilot initiative and the second half will examine the individual cases within the dominant partnership categories within this case study.

Figure 4.2 provides an overview of the dynamic of partnership working within the GYLG pilot initiative. *safe*food*’s role as sole funder and boundary spanner within the pilot initiative immediately reinforces a power dynamic within the GYLG partnership. Although *safe*food instigated the partnership processes and exhibited an eagerness to engage in partnership relations, the organisation were also slow to
Figure 4.2 Summary of Partners Engaged in the Get Your Life in Gear Initiative

- **safe/food**
  - Sole funder of the pilot initiative therefore provided the resources to manage the programme on a daily basis, however, lacked sufficient resources in all related areas.

- **Internal Group**
  - A working group that met throughout the pilot initiative to discuss its progress. It comprised of experts within safe/food in the areas of nutrition and communication.

- **Steering Group**
  - Comprised of eight individuals representing a variety of organisations with expertise in areas such as obesity, men’s health, occupational health and communication.

- **Pilot site managers**
  - These managers were approached to participate in the project. Four managers were involved in the pilot initiative — three were service station/restaurant managers, one was a distribution centre manager.

- **Agency Workers**
  - Numerous agencies were commissioned to carry out work during the pilot initiative in the following areas:
    - Design of the initiatives collateral, formative research, health check implementation and trailer hire.

*Arrows represent the dominant lines of communication*
relinquish control or ownership relating to initiative. For example, the project leaders managed all communications throughout the project, it was considered two-way, however communication between partnership categories did not materialise.

From Figure 4.2 it is apparent that different partnership categories did not formally interact with each other, the exception being organisations that were represented on more than one category of partner. Instead, the safefood project leaders assumed the role of boundary spanners within the pilot initiative consequently interacting with all partners involved. This ensured that the partnership management process was as simplistic as possible for the project leaders and that a single but reciprocal (two way) line of communication was maintained. Also, as the funder of the pilot initiative the project leaders coordinated efforts at every level whilst keeping the partners informed and consulting them in relation to decision-making processes.

The supplier partner group will be discussed first, followed by an analysis of the internal group’s decisions relating to partnership selection.

### 4.4.1 Supplier Partners

All the supplier partners who participated in operationalising the GYLG pilot initiative were contacted and fully briefed on the project via the project leaders. In all cases these supplier partners were financially remunerated for their services. This was the major differentiating factor between this type of partner and the others discussed within this chapter. From a practical perspective without the use of these partners or intermediaries it would not have been possible to implement the GYLG pilot initiative.

Two of the supplier partners commissioned to assist in operationalising the pilot initiative were under a long standing contractual agreement with safefood, meaning that the project leaders were limited in their choice of design and consumer research agency. The advantage of utilising firms with longstanding relationships, was that there was a pre-established confidence in their ability to deliver on the brief they were assigned. From past experiences working with these agencies, particularly the representatives managing the account, ensured that a heightened level of trust was
already present firstly that the agency would fulfil the brief and secondly that they would protect the brand identity (Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007).

Other supplier partners such as the logistical solutions firm had previously carried out work for other safefood projects on an ad hoc basis however, were not under contractual agreement. Although, these partners had never worked with the project leaders before, from the beginning of the interaction they were very amenable to their requests, for example, supplying additional heaters in the trailers. This enhanced the level of trust associated with this type of partner.

In the case of the health check service providers, two non-profit organisations (NPO) (one NI and one ROI) that also had a previous relationship with safefood were commissioned to implement this aspect of the project. One of these organisations was already involved in the external steering committee for the GYLG pilot initiative. safefood had previously formed relationships with these organisations whilst developing other campaigns however, had not worked with the departments or personnel responsible for coordinating the health checks. Other commercial organisations were also approached to tender for the project, however were not awarded the contract. The chosen NPOs were competitively priced and deemed more flexible in the services they offered which was an advantageous attribute for this particular project. Both NPOs also had previous experience conducting health checks in unconventional settings, working with men in particular and had experience working on similar projects. Flexibility was important within this project as the partners wanted to offer a consistent initiative across the IOI meaning where possible the same health check measurements were offered to participants as well as the same materials. This consistency was also helpful in terms of evaluating the pilot initiative.

From the health check service provider’s perspective both NPOs enhanced the partnership through their level of knowledge and expertise. These highly trained professionals were amenable to promoting the GYLG pilot initiative, however, also supplemented the pilot initiatives material with their own literature where necessary. It should be noted that although the NPO’s did receive payment for their services; they also exhibited flexibility in terms of reduce costing’s for undertaking the health
check and the type of service they provided when participating in the pilot project. This was a reflection on the anticipation that the project would be continued in the future.

4.4.2 Internal Working Group Project Management

An internal cross directorate project management team was established within *safefood* to coordinate the GYLG pilot initiative. This team were responsible for the planning and implementation of the GYLG pilot initiative and comprised of senior staff from Human Health and Nutrition (HNN) and Marketing Communication (M&C) directorates as well as their respective team members. The cross directive nature of this project planning team ensured that the pilot initiative was strengthened by the synergising of complementary expertise from both directorates. This approach ensured that the scientific evidence supporting the initiative was communicated in an easily comprehensible manner to the target audience. Two individuals were assigned responsibility for the daily management of the project; one from M&C and the other from HHN. Although both team leaders were employed by *safefood*, they worked in two different offices located in Dublin and Cork. This resulted in the telephone, teleconferencing and email dominating as the primary forms of communication between meetings. Where possible, face-to-face meetings were also arranged to discuss the project plan for the pilot initiative particularly when major decisions were needed, for example, choosing the design elements.

4.4.2.1 Competing Ideologies

Although this type of cross directorate internal partnership was routine within *safefood*, the competing ideologies of the team leaders (social marketing versus health promotion) caused friction throughout the project particularly during the earlier formative stages. The continuing debate between the team leaders on the pros on cons of both social marketing and health promotion had implications on the length of time taken to plan the pilot initiative. For example, this debate impacted on the strategic decision making processes as the project leaders had difficulty agreeing on the direction and size of the initiative. Before partners could be selected and
approached, the project leaders were required to agree on the organisations stance on the project and their preferred strategic direction.

In retrospect, the GYLG pilot initiative was the first of its kind developed within safefood, an organisation that to that point had depended on the principles of health promotion to guide activities, an area their HNN team were trained in. Within the organisation, the researcher was the only ‘employee’ who had training or experience using social marketing. As social marketing was relatively new, the central tenets of both (social marketing and health promotion) were heavily debated by the project leaders and at times tension manifested as a result. This issue was further intensified as the organisation as a whole did not fully comprehend what social marketing was and how it achieved its goals. This tension was however, usually dissolved with the understanding that both team leaders were working towards a common purpose, tackling male obesity and that an initiative had to be developed. Also, both ideologies had commonalities that could be built on, where they differed was with social marketers reliance on the 4P’s of the marketing mix. However, the undercurrents of this argument remained throughout the process between the project leaders. Social marketing was eventually accepted as the preferred approach for this project as it was supported by the M&C director, who was interested in assessing its fit with the organisations activities.

4.4.2.2 Previous Partnership Experience

The level of experience regarding partnership working also differed between the project leaders. The researcher representing the M&C team was new to both the organisation and the public health environment therefore did not have any prior knowledge of any pre-established relationships safefood had with stakeholders or partners in the area. This meant that at the beginning of the initiative, the researcher was reliant on other staff members for guidance on the history of the organisations stakeholders and partnerships. This guidance related to both the type of organisation safefood had previously engaged with as well as the personality and working style of the personnel related to that partner.
“We have begun discussing the types of organisations who could become partners on this project, I have been reliant on getting to grips with the potential cohort and have started asking more experienced staff for advice on who we could talk to. ** has a good understanding of who we should be talking to, has worked in safefood before and has a passion for Men’s Health, so she knows who the key players are. ** is going to initiate contact with the person responsible for writing the Men’s Health policy. If we could get this meeting it will really help the project due to his invaluable level of experience and the contacts he can connect us with...

(Researchers diary extract 15/07/2008)

The HHN project leader was appointed to her role a few months earlier and had previously worked within safefood therefore had a degree of knowledge of safefood’s existing partners, stakeholders and their role particularly in the area of obesity. This project leader had developed a professional relationship with some of the stakeholders through specific projects and attending work related meeting. This knowledge assisted in the GYLG partnership selection process, as there was a prior awareness of these stakeholders area of expertise and the networks in which they were engaged in. Now that the level of pre-existing knowledge relating to partners and stakeholders has been clarified, discussion will revert to the identification of potential partners.

4.4.3 Organisational Needs Assessment

The first task in the partnership selection process was to conduct a preliminary needs assessment of the safefood organisation and the potential target audience for the pilot initiative. This identified the type of pilot initiative that could be implemented as well as an understanding of the resource capacity of safefood as an organisation. This pilot initiative also had to fulfil the organisational requirements of safefood, meaning it needed to fit safefood’s strategic objectives, which identified areas they wished to tackle. The overall rationale of the campaign was specified from the outset prior to partnership selection, meaning that partners would be selected based on this very specific topic area. Any initiative would have to address the issue of male obesity on the island of Ireland (IOI); this assertion is explicitly stated in the
following extract from the research proposal, which was submitted for the approval of safefood’s Executive Board to secure funding for the project.

“...Gender differences between those who are obese has also emerged as the instance of male obesity now exceeds that of their female counterparts (DOHC 2005). Research also indicates that men are at greater risk of developing health difficulties associated with weight gain and are less likely to engage in dieting (DeSouza and Ciclitira 2007) or weight loss services (White, Conrad and Branney 2008)...” (Extract from research proposal 11/08/2008)

The research proposal also stipulated a preference for a workplace campaign as evidence suggests positive outcomes when targeting men in this setting (WHO 2004). These were the only stipulations that were predefined; the actual design of the pilot initiative remained flexible.

The decision to specifically target a male truck driver population as opposed to a generic adult population was strategic and meant that safefood needed support from outside organisations that had more experience engaging men in unconventional work settings.

“...Today we held our first meeting relating to the men’s project. A situational analysis on the issue of male obesity is already underway, they had already decided before I started to target male construction workers – this idea was scrapped due to the recession, another target group needs to be selected and a stakeholder analysis completed – the research so far indicates that engaging any group of males with their health is going to be hard – expert advice needs to be sought asap... ” (Diary extract 09/07/ 2008)

safefood were satisfied that within the organisation there was a high level of knowledge and resources available relating to nutritional advice and weight loss strategies. However, when addressing obesity, evidence suggests that a multifaceted approach yields a higher impact for such complex issues (Butland, Jebb et al. 2007).
This evidence broadens the type of support needed to implement the pilot initiative beyond nutrition to include for example physical activity expertise, men’s health advisors both at policy and practitioner level, occupational health specialists and industry experts from the chosen workplace.

Prior to the development of this initiative, safefood did not use any formal framework to identify potential partners to involve in their campaigns. Instead, like other social marketers apparent within the literature (Weinrich 2011; Lee 2007) lessons were learnt from evaluating previous campaign delivery and partnership activities. This experience within safefood inadvertently guided the partnership selection process. These lessons were not written down; however, they were communicated to the researcher through various informal conversations with various safefood staff members. The learnings included; choosing organisations whose overall goals or mission converged with safefood’s, meaning they were dedicated to addressing the overarching issue of obesity in some capacity. This did not mean that the specific organisational objectives between the partners were reciprocated; however they could not be conflicting. Desirable partners should also have access to complementary tangible and intangible resources which when combined with safefood’s enhanced the impact, visibility and reach of the campaign. This level of impact could not be achieved if safefood were to go it alone. Where relevant and appropriate safefood also preferred to partner with organisations they had a previous relationship with as a partner or stakeholder. To build and maintain these relationships over time had been resource intensive for the organisation and therefore safefood were eager to continue to nurture them into the future. The benefits of reforming these partnerships included a pre-established level of trust through positive working relationships coupled with an understanding of the types of resources that were available and the values of the organisation. safefood also knew what to expect from the partner in terms of for instance fulfilling tasks and resource allocation. As an IOI entity safefood were further required to engage with partners and stakeholders in Northern Ireland (NI) and Republic of Ireland (ROI). This was an important task particularly to build brand visibility in NI which enhanced their credibility as an expert in communicating nutrition and food safety related messaging.
The partnership identification process took considerable time, spanning months before a final list of potential partners were agreed upon. A number of factors contributed to the length of this process; as the project leaders had not clearly defined the target audience it was difficult to contact the potential partners as the project leaders could not provide them with adequate information on the project. Also, during the formative stage the directors closely monitored the progress of the project leaders and therefore sign off of major decisions was needed from the directors which slowed the process. During this period, the project leaders were also redeployed on other projects, therefore the time allocated to scoping out potential partners was reduced.

The management of the partnership process is demonstrated by the inclusion of topics referring to the establishment of a ‘steering group’ and other ‘potential partnerships’ on the agenda for the first meeting of the internal working group. At this juncture the target group had not been defined therefore an in-depth discussion could not take place. However, the intensity of the discussion increased in the consecutive meetings that followed.

“Steering group

Membership of the steering group was discussed. It was suggested that perhaps Donal Lunny (truck driver who appeared on Gerry Ryan’s ‘Operation Transformation’) should be contacted with a view to membership or insight.

Agreed: Steering group should be convened as soon as possible.
Agreed: Membership of the group should be limited to a small number.
Action: Project leaders⁴ to identify potential participants and circulate.”

(Except from Internal Meeting Minutes12/09/2008)

This extract attributes the responsibility of managing partnership selection to the project leaders. However, the series of minutes from the first six months of the
internal working group identify these meetings as an opportunity to deliberate and consult on the types of partners that needed to fulfil the requirements of the GYLG pilot initiative.

4.4.4 Stakeholder Analysis

The next major determinant in the partnership selection process relates to the specific choice of the primary target cohort and the impact this had on broadening the network of stakeholders and therefore potential partners. In planning this campaign although safefood’s agenda was to tackle the issue of male obesity, the principles of social marketing ensured the further segmentation of the male population, making partnership selection more specific and specialised. Two possible cohorts were originally identified by safefood, truck drivers and taxi drivers as potential targets for this campaign. A situational analysis was carried out for both.

The extensive situational analysis on the two potential cohorts identified various types of stakeholders who could potentially add value to the GYLG pilot initiative. As a result, the project leaders spent a considerable amount of time contacting a range of stakeholders who had experience with similar initiatives for advice on how best to plan this pilot initiative and for recommendations for strategic partnerships with key experts in related fields. For example, the author of the Men’s Health policy, a Health Promotion Officer in a bus company who had developed a lifestyle programme for bus drivers and a PhD supervisor who was assisting in a men’s health project were all contacted to discuss their experiences engaging men with their health. These individuals also provided insight into the type of support needed to implement this type of project.

“It was noted again that buy-in from the key stakeholders associated with these groups was essential and that if this was not obtained, the target groups may have to be reviewed.

Agreed: Proceed with both target groups (truck and taxi drivers) at present and engage with key stakeholders to elicit support and resultant target group selection”. (Excerpt from internal group minutes September 2008)
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This discussion took place in parallel to those relating to the development of the initiatives strategy and partnership formation. This extract suggests that stakeholders can have a level of power and influence over behavioural change strategies and can even determine the selection of target audiences. This extract, therefore also reinforces the reality that partnership centred campaigns are situated in a hyper competitive marketplace whereby one organisation cannot facilitate change on their own (Hastings and Donovan 2002). Stakeholders facilitate access not only to the target audience, but also to their network of influencers (for example friends, employees, policy makers). When analysing truck and taxi drivers as potential target audiences, there was an awareness of the diverse range, layers and networks of direct and indirect stakeholders that would be interested in engaging with this pilot initiative. However, from a practical perspective the reference to ‘key’ in the previous extract reinforced the necessity to prioritise relationships; particularly, as it was not feasible or manageable to engage with every influencer. This awareness was also balanced with an understanding that not every potential stakeholder or would be partner perceived value in participating in the project.

Stakeholders within this pilot initiative were differentiated from partners in this pilot initiative as they were viewed as potential influencers of the change endeavour, supporting the pilot initiatives activities without heavily investing resources. Examples of stakeholder activities included organisations that sent materials to the project leaders upon request and pledged to be of assistance when necessary. Based on the outcome of the pilot initiatives there was also the possibility of further engagement or partnership working with these stakeholders in the future.

“I spent today researching stakeholders in the key areas related to the project focusing on obesity, men’s health and the truck driving industry – we are keen to get industry on board. Once this list is finalised we will need to prioritise our lists to the stakeholders who we feel would have greatest impact on the project. A variety of organisations could be included in the project and therefore more guidance is needed before a decision is made....”

(Excerpt from field notes 10th October 2008)
Once truck drivers were chosen as the target audience, from an early juncture in this initiative, stakeholders referred to any direct or indirect organisation/individual that had a vested interest in truck drivers ranging from general men’s health organisations to employers to road safety. Each stakeholder was identified to have a purpose, therefore depending on their role, they had the ability to act as gatekeepers as advocates for the pilot initiative, points of access or influencers. Techniques such as SWOT and PESTEL analysis were utilised to assist in the mapping of potential stakeholders, a difficult task as a result of the fragmented nature of the industry (See Appendix C).

The stakeholder analysis aspect of the project was not considered static. Throughout the duration of the GYLG pilot initiative additional stakeholders emerged as individuals and organisations became aware of the intervention. This was also reciprocated by the project leaders as they became more knowledgeable about the networks of influencers on truck driver behaviours. Engagement with stakeholders at this level was dominated by information sharing, for example asking for advice and guidance or sharing of articles. It was not uncommon for the project leaders to contact project coordinators within the National Health Service (NHS) who had designed similar projects and ask their advice. The global social marketing listserv was also used as a portal to contact fellow social marketers who had worked with truck drivers in the past. Throughout this stakeholder analysis phase, the project leaders worked continuously to ensure that the finalise initiative adopted a best practice approach to engaging this target cohort.

“… felt that the health professionals needed to have a certain demeanor to work and engage with these types of drivers. They would also need to be used to working in a non-clinical setting.

When asked about the waiting periods for the drivers Helen felt that flyers and posters will not be enough to recruit drivers for the checks. Someone with the right type of personality needs to be on site to recruit the drivers and get them involved.”(Excerpt from minutes from a teleconference with a

---

5 Names has been changed to protect identity
stakeholder who had experience implementing men’s health initiatives (26/8/09).

The preceding extract demonstrates a willingness amongst stakeholders to share information and expertise. This person was contacted by the project leaders due to her experience engaging truck drivers with her health. This person never had the expectation that she would become a partner in this pilot initiative as for example, she resided outside its jurisdiction. She was however, eager and willing to share her experiences as she had a vested interest in the issue (truck driver/men’s health) and appreciated the difficulties of successfully targeting this audience.

This discussion of the implications of stakeholder engagement supports French’s (2010) interpretation whereby stakeholders are acknowledged to have an interest in an issue however are not engaged in the delivery of the programme. It is these individual stakeholders, that when brought together form linkages or networks to work towards a common goal or purpose and as a result manifest into a deeper relationship referred to in this instance as ‘partnerships’.

The beginning of this section has identified the first two stages in the social marketing partnership selection process, firstly a needs assessment of the organisations resources and capabilities and secondly a stakeholder analysis of the networks that directly or indirectly affect the target audience. As a result of these activities two dominant categories of partners were identified, that would maximise the potential of a truck driver pilot initiative. These categories are referred to as the External Steering Committee partners and pilot site managers (see Figure 4.2). The characteristics of each category of partner are discussed separately as each was selected for differing reasons.

As the external steering committee was established first, it is the first to be discussed.
4.5 External Advisory Group

The purpose of the external advisory group was to guide the strategic development of the GYLG pilot initiative. As an outcome of the needs assessment and stakeholder analysis three dominant areas were thought to influence the pilot initiative, obesity, men’s health and truck driver health/wellbeing. safefood had competencies in some of these areas, other such as the specific characteristics of the truck driving industry were new to them. After further analysis of the direct and indirect factors that affect these influencers the project leaders identified key areas of expertise that they wanted assistance with including:

- Obesity – specifically engaging men with their weight
- Workplace programme development
- Nutrition
- Physical Activity
- Health promotion
- Men’s Health
- Occupational Health
- Truck driver industry
- Social Marketing
- Policy implementation

From an organisational perspective, safefood sought to partner with organisations who could complement their expertise and maximise the efficiency of their monetary and non-monetary resource allocation to increase the success of the initiative. For instance, within safefood, staff members had expertise and knowledge in specific areas such as social marketing and men’s health. However, they lacked the network of support that other well established experts could utilise to increase the impact both at a policy and community level. safefood were also confident in their ability to provide nutritional and weight loss advice, however, they sought assistance in how to effectively engage/communicate with the male truck driving audience so they were motivated to change. Partners that were selected complemented each other in
terms of the sharing of tangible and intangible resources which resulted in increased credibility for the pilot. Simultaneously, safefood were also aware of maintaining their brand identity and as a government funded agency did not want to partner with any organisation that could corrode their credibility. The project leaders were also conscious of developing relationships with a mixture of sectors, academics, practitioners and policy influencers.

Those who were invited to the initial external advisory group meeting were a mixture of organisational representatives who had previously worked with safefood and those who had not as. The areas that safefood had previously had a relationship with were the traditional stakeholders in the area of obesity. The newer partners had expertise specific to this initiative including men’s health and the truck driving industry.

“Agreed: Potential participants include Noel Richardson (Health Service Executive), Maureen Mulvihill (Irish Heart Foundation) and Christine Domegan (NUIG).
Agreed: Group needs to have a practical element and a representative from the target group.” (Excerpt from Internal Minutes July 2008).

The academic representatives ensured that the intervention was rigorous whereas representatives within the industry would provide guidance on the feasibility of any proposed action.

From a manageability perspective the project leaders were aware of the difficulties coordinating a large number of partners on a project of this magnitude. Ten was considered an optimum number and representatives from the shortlisted organisations were invited to participate. One organisation that was selected based on their perceived influence over the trucking industry declined to participate. This organisation received just one weeks’ notice as to the scheduling of the first external group meeting. The delay in distributing the invitation was caused by difficulties determining who would be the most appropriate industry representative. The project
leader telephoned this representative prior to the distribution of the invitation to verbally introduce the GYLG pilot initiative. This initiative was the first of its kind targeted at truck drivers on the IOI therefore the project leaders anticipated confusion in relation to its relevance to their organisation. This conversation was followed up by an email that reinforced the rationale for their participation in an obesity related topic:-

“Dear ***

As per our telephone conversation I have attached an invitation letter explaining the role of our external steering group meeting on Wednesday the 3rd of December in Dublin which commences at 10.30.

At present, safefood are in the planning stages of developing a social marketing initiative targeting employees in the road haulage industry. This pilot will specifically examine issues and barriers pertaining to physical activity and nutrition for road hauliers with the aim of combating the increasing number of obese men on the island of Ireland. We believe that at this early stage of development it would be beneficial to have a representative of your organisation at this meeting as you would have first hand practical experience of the daily routines and needs of road hauliers. Your ideas and input into the project would also be appreciated.” (Excerpt from email to potential external partner 28 November 2008)

Their inability to attend disappointed the project leaders, however, given the short notice of the invitation it was understandable. Industry representation or approval was considered a valuable asset for accessing truck drivers as it would increase the credibility of the pilot initiative within the industry. The organisation who declined to participate was a potential lobby group that could have raised the profile for environmental and/or systems change at an upstream level in parallel with the pilot initiative.
This decline reintroduced the issue of trust of partners as perceived by the target cohort. *safefood* were keen to invite another industry representative to join the external group along with the employer that had already agreed to participate. They consulted the formative research which had been conducted since the stakeholder analysis for assistance. The formative research indicated that the drivers distrusted the intensions of organisations that were associated with industry legislative or policy change. They believed that these organisations were not motivated by the wellbeing of the drivers and therefore their participation would devalue the initiative. For this reason, no other industry body was asked to participate on the external group.

“Associations with Industry Bodies: Most drivers were quite suspicious of industry organisations such as Road Haulage Association or Driver Vehicle Licensing Northern Ireland and felt that a Workplace Programme associated with any of these organisations might presage an ulterior motive” (Except from formative research 2009)

The representative that declined to participate was kept informed of the next meeting as requested, however, was also unavailable to participate in that meeting also and never exhibited enthusiasm to participate. The project planners were aware of the turmoil within the trucking industry related to rising fuel costs and the overall cost of doing business on the IOI which drove the agenda of such an organisation. During the same week as the initial invitations were distributed there was allegations in the media in relation to one of their senior management’s personal business practices. Overall, this organisation was tasked with representing the wellbeing of truck drivers; however, at this point the issue of truck driver weight management was not a priority for the organisation. At that point in time their agendas did not converge with *safefood*’s, which manifested in a lack of motivation to participate. This outcome reinforces the influence of changing external environment for setting organisational agendas (Bentz, Dorfman *et al.* 2005).
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4.5.1 Partnership Engagement

The attendees of the first meeting were invited to participate on what safefood referred to as an External Advisory Group. This multi-sectoral grouping symbolised an acceptance of a holistic approach to behavioural change whereby obesity became the issue or common denominator between many interrelated areas.

The steering committee received one formal invitation to participate in the group during the formative stage of the pilot initiative which was sent by the Chief Executive of safefood as opposed to the project leaders. The Chief Executive was not involved in the daily management of the project; however, had sanctioned it. The CEO also acted as Chairperson at the external advisory group meetings. This type of top-level support was symbolic of the organisation’s commitment to the project and reinforced GYLG authority and credibility. The content of this letter focused on introducing the issue of male obesity, providing context and emphasising the importance of stakeholder engagement.

“To oversee the initiative, an Internal Steering Group has been convened and this group will be complemented by an External Advisory Group representative of key stakeholders in the areas of men’s health, obesity, occupational health, industry and employees, among others. Given your expertise in x area, I would like to invite you to join the External Advisory Group” (External Advisory Group invitation letter distributed 21/10/2008).

This invitation letter did not explicitly introduce the possibility of developing a partnership. Instead the issue (obesity) itself was utilised as a motivator to participate. The term ‘steering group’ had connotations of guidance as one of the main objectives of engaging in the initiative.

As the advisory group had not been fully briefed on what the project entailed, the first meeting was planned as an introduction to the initiative in its entirety. During this initial meeting it was important that safefood portrayed their commitment to the project. By communicating the importance of this issue from a holistic perspective,
reinforcing its complexity and thus encouraging active participation, the project leaders tried to ensure that the value propositions discussed met the organisational agendas of those who were asked to attend. For example, when identifying the advantages for engaging employers, benefits were framed in terms of health, safety, employer benefits (for example employees taking fewer sick days) and policy implications. From the perspective of heart disease and cancer focused stakeholders the health benefits of tackling obesity were interlinked.

4.5.2 Partnership Agreement

The earliest indicator of partnership working was initiated at the first steering group meeting whereby the chair (the CEO of safefood) explicitly verbalised the organisation’s openness to working in partnership.

“...The chair stated that safefood would welcome partnerships. **6 and ** stated that the ** and **, respectively, would support the initiative as appropriate” (Minutes from first external group meeting December 2009).

This conversation took place after a lengthy introduction to both the proposed project and the roles that the attendees could fulfil. After consideration by participants, a willingness to participate was immediately verbalised by the group as a whole however, the expectations of the partnership were not discussed in detail.

At this point the importance of trust, commitment, shared values and mutual benefit have been introduced as important factors when initiating partnerships. The next section will examine the factors that affect the management of the partnership.

4.5.3 Communication

The communication between the steering group members was initially extremely formal. Where previous relationships with safefood had not previously been established, project leaders showed a willingness to travel to meet potential partners.

6 The names of the organisations have been omitted to protect their identities and are represented as **
face to face. In one instance, both project leaders travelled to Kilkenny to meet a potential partner for the first time. The decision was made to travel to meet this stakeholder to symbolise a commitment to the project and to highlight to this stakeholder an eagerness to work with them within this project. This face-to-face meeting was also an opportunity to scope out the resources that could be available to the project leaders through a partnership agreement.

- ** is currently piloting a two-day programme for men’s health training. He is willing to engage with us in terms of providing this training to those who will eventually be involved in delivering the programme.
- He is also willing to engage with us in the context of his work with the Health Service Executive (HSE) in terms of the research aspect of the programme.
- Men’s Health Forum in Ireland would also be willing to provide support in terms of advice. Lorcan Brennan is a member of this group and is also coordinator with the Men’s Health Development Network. He would also be a good contact. Paula Carroll is also a Men’s Health Researcher with HSE and WIT. (Extract from stakeholder meeting minutes 24/07/2008)

This individual accepted an invitation to participate on the advisory committee.

Formal lines of communication were also symbolised by the distribution of traditional written postal invitations. This letter was also utilised as an opportunity to identify the norm of the correspondence for the remainder of the project. Within this invitation, the project coordinator was formally introduced as was a more direct line of contact.

“I look forward to receiving a favourable response, however, if in the meantime, you require any further details of the review please do not hesitate in contacting me, or my colleague Sinead Duane (email: sduane@safefood.eu or direct line 00353 (0)1 4480605), who will be coordinating the project.”(Excerpt from invitation letter 25/06/2009)
As the above extract articulates, from this point emails dominated as the preferred form of communication. As the relationship matured between the steering group these emails remained formal throughout the project. Conversely, as the project planners began to utilise the resources of the partners within this group, the correspondence between individual partners over time became less formal without losing a professional persona. However, communication channels within the partner organisations changed throughout the project depending on the stage of the project and the tasks that needed to be completed, as well as fluctuations in personal. This change in channel resulted in the project leaders reverting to a more formalised style of email in terms of the language used until the project leaders became more familiar with this newly appointed point of contact.

4.5.3.1 Frequency and Quality of Communication

Three external meetings were held throughout the duration of the GYLG pilot initiative (Dec 2008, June 2009 and Oct 2010). A fourth was planned before the pilot initiative launched however, it never manifested due to scheduling difficulties. After the initial two meetings a draft plan of the project was circulated to the group via email, and partners reverted back with comments.

“The main challenge here is not so much with programme content but delivery. How will you get access to the men; how will the information/initiatives be delivered at coalface. This is a real challenge with the target group” (Feedback from project plan draft document 02/07/2009).

“Is this practical given the nature of the work environment? Maybe a session tagged onto the health check or a stand to advertise our plans based on workers’ feedback?” (Feedback from project plan draft document 02/07/2009)

These comments were merged into one document and re-circulated to the programme partners. This method of communicating became the norm for the remainder of the project in the absence of face to face contact. In parallel to these email discussions with the external advisory group, the project leaders were tasked
with finalising the pilot initiative plan based on their interpretation of these comments. It was also not possible to accept every suggestion from the group. This was a difficult task given that the project leaders were not in the same offices and therefore spent a lot of time on the phone debating the next steps. Some conversations lasted over an hour long. Also, resulting from the first meeting, the social marketing versus health promotion debate had been brought to the forefront this time by members of the advisory group.

“The difference between health promotion and social marketing was debated at length. CD stated that the aim of social marketing is to create sustainable behaviour change based on marketing principles and that it is this which distinguishes it from health promotion. It was argued that health promotion also focuses on behaviour change...” (Except from the first advisory group meeting 3/12/2008)

This uncertainty about the benefits of adopting a marketing approach again caused tension between the project leaders as they tried to reconcile their differences. Even coupled with the comments of the advisory group the project leaders had different preferences for the best course of action. Over time and with discussions within the internal meetings, a compromise was reached and the project planning continued.

Since the second meeting where the initiatives strategy was discussed, the project planners were under increasing pressure to roll out the pilot initiative. Reasons for this included budget cuts and reallocation of internal resources reinforcing the implementation of the project as a priority. Although the planning for this campaign had began in mid 2008 when the researcher was placed in safefood, the strategising of a ‘men’s project’ had began the previous year (2007). Therefore in 2009, there was a perception among some staff members within safefood that the project was taking a long time to materialise. Therefore internal pressure was increased to roll out the project before year-end. This ultimately had an impact on the level of active participation of the external advisory group.
On reflection, ideally the number of face-to-face meetings with this category of partner as a whole could have been increased. The project leaders were aware that through a lack of communication, the motivation to engage amongst the partners could dwindle; they were also conscious that too many meetings was also unrealistic. Partners travelled from across the IOI to attend and therefore three/four would be an appropriate number. To compensate for the lack of face-to-face contact, partners communicated through emails. These emails were usually initiated by the *safefood* project leaders and followed up by the respective partners. From this perspective, other methods of communication could have been maintained such as an online forum and Skype/teleconferencing.

"An update to the external group must go out this week identifying the progress that has been made within the initiative. It is difficult to balance communication with this group and ensure that the operational needs of the programme have been met and I don’t want to circulate an update that contains no new information." (Excerpt from field notes 25/07/2009)

Like the face-to-face meetings, these emails could also have increased in frequency, they were often sent sporadically as the project planners wanted to ensure that vital information was communicated as opposed to an update that contained no new developments. The project leaders could also have circulated short bi-monthly briefing documents.

As the planning continued the project planners were also conscious that they did not want any materials published without prior approval from the group as they valued their opinions. The project leaders valued and highly respected the opinions of the external advisory group members, they had invested a lot of time choosing appropriate partners with expertise in specific areas. This meant the project leaders remained eager for the partners to actively participate. In reality, in some instances material was distributed to the external group with short deadlines for returning comments. Those who were able to comment on the briefs supplied by the project leaders provided insightful suggestions on the design and implementation of the pilot initiative which influenced the way it was delivered. For example, the project planners wanted to ensure that the external advisory group were involved with
drafting the truck driver booklet. A consultation process took place on the topics that should be included in the resource, based on the needs of the target group whilst avoiding duplicating existing resources. To manage this process, the external advisory group were shown the final draft of the copy and imagery of the resource so they could comment on the ‘product’ in its entirety, including its aesthetic appeal. This decision had implications on the length of time the partners had to review the information, due to delays and productions schedules turnaround was quite quick for final signoff.

“One of the external group rang me about the truck driver booklet. Overall they thought the content was good and the key topics had been included. They did raise a query in relation to the portion sizes depicted in a number of images which they wanted to discuss at the next meeting. From a safefood perspective these images had been passed by our nutrition team as they were satirical to add humour to the product and were not expected to depict actual portion sizes...” (Except from researchers diary 31/08/09)

Although face-to-face contact was less frequent than originally anticipated, the programme planners corresponded with partners more regularly on an individual basis as they continued to invest in the pilot initiative. Where necessary, the project leaders travelled to meet these partners on a face to face basis to discuss their role in the project. Some of the participants in the external advisory group were more active than others in assisting with the implementation of the campaign. This was reflective of their area of expertise; for instance, the representative who had experience implementing workplace programmes and physical activity related interventions played an instrumental role in implementing the pilot initiative.

4.5.3.2 Information Sharing

As the relationship progressed between members of the external advisory group and the safefood project leaders, the expectations of the project leaders relating to cooperation between parties within this grouping exceeded information sharing. As the previous section discussing stakeholder analysis suggested, information sharing was a valuable aspect of the stakeholder engagement process.
From: Sinead Duane [mailto:sduane@safefood.eu]
Sent: 11 July 2008 10:32
Subject: Men’s Weight Loss Initiative

Good morning,

My name is Sinead Duane and I working for the health promotion agency in Ireland safefood. We are devising a workplace programme for men focusing on the achievement/maintenance of a healthy weight. We are currently conducting a needs assessment to help us identify our target audience. I am enquiring if you have heard of or have information on any workplace initiatives of this nature? Or concurrently any known ‘experts’ in this area that would be able to give us some guidance when developing our strategy?

Kind Regards

Sinead Duane

-------------------------------------------------------------

Sent: 15 July 2008 09:15
To: Sinead Duane
Subject: RE: Men’s Weight Loss Initiative

Hi Sinead - I have forwarded your email to some of my colleagues who may be more up to date on actual initiatives - all the best Alison (Email correspondence between stakeholders 15/07/2009)

As the partnerships progressed with the external advisory group the expectations moved beyond the mere sharing of information to greater investments in terms of tangible and intangible resources. This type of cooperation was identified as being outcome of a trusting and committed relationship, as the more committed the organisation was the greater the investment in the pilot initiative. In some cases organisations were known to be committed to the issue (male obesity) however, for various reasons not as committed to the project. There are numerous reasons for this
assertion ranging from the internal organisational objectives of the partner to *safefood* wholly funding the pilot and therefore managing the implementation of the pilot initiative. Therefore, it could have been construed that *safefood* owned the project.

Cooperative working with members of the external advisory group manifested in many different demeanours throughout the duration of the project ranging from time, sharing of knowledge and expertise, assistance in strategy development and sharing of materials. Conversely, the project leaders discussed the need to manage the sharing of these resources in a more formalised fashion through process evaluations, minutes from meetings and also written agreements between selected partners involved in the initiative. In the majority of cases related to sharing of expertise this formal approach was deemed unnecessary and through the minutes of meeting the allocation of roles and responsibilities were adequately met. One exception related to the adoption and usage of resources previously developed by a partner organisation within the GYLG pilot initiative.

*safefood* had a pre-existing relationship with one particular partner prior to GYLG which the project leaders wanted to preserve beyond this pilot initiative. The project leaders also wanted to be clear about what was expected of all parties within the partnership. To protect this relationship and manage the expectations a formal memorandum of understanding (MOU) was drafted by the project leaders. This type of document was a standardised template that *safefood* used when working in partners.

*A Memorandum of agreement with *** and branding was discussed and it was agreed that it should be circulated to the *** albeit quite formal. The *** request to be branded on material was acknowledged. (Excerpt from minutes of the internal group meeting 10/09/09)*

The contents of this agreement were adapted from a verbal agreement between the project leaders and the partner who developed the resource. The usage of the resource, a walking challenge which was slighted modified to encourage the truck drivers to be physically active had been discussed extensively between the two
organisations. The majority of the contents of the MOU referred to the permission for adapting the resource, branding issues and the ownership of the product. It also spanned to the other related activities they were involved with within the GYLG pilot initiative.

“It is agreed that safefood and *** will work collaboratively on the Getting Your Life into Gear pilot. This memorandum of agreement is intended to cover the duration of the pilot and those activities that will be addressed over the period of the agreement. Elements involved in the agreement are as follows:

safefood and the *** will meet as necessary, to discuss the project.

The following activities will form the basis of the partnership:

1. The continued development of the Getting Your Life into Gear program.
2. The pilot of the Getting Your Life in Gear program.
3. The evaluation of the long term effectiveness of the pilot...

(Except from Memorandum of Understanding 09/09/09)

Shortly after this agreement was sent to the partner’s representative, a phone call was made to a Director within safefood in relation to its content. The representative then called the project leaders whom they had a long-standing relationship with to articulate their discontent with the MOU. Arguably this formal contract, which was standard practice for safefood, did more damage to the partnership then if it had not existed. As a result the project leaders had to invest a lot of time and energy to reconcile for this grievance.

Although the project leaders felt that this MOU accurately reflected what had been previously verbally agreed, on review, the partner NGO sought greater recognition for the resource that had been adopted in relation to branding. As a written or formal contract, the magnitude of the agreement intensified and branding became the main area of discontent within the document. The organisation sought greater acknowledgement for a resource they had heavily invested in developing. As a NGO, if their brand is not maintained and acknowledged they may lose out on a
source of revenue, their brand may also lose its impact related to their advocacy work. Additionally, without sufficient acknowledgement they could not maintain the ownership of the resource which the organisation was still promoting to organisations beyond the pilot initiative.

As an outcome of this event, for a brief period, tension had manifested within the partnership. The project planners had not intentionally tried to deceive the partner and worked quickly to rectify the situation. The Director had succeeded in defusing the situation maintaining the relationship, however, changes needed to be made to the contentious resource. To rectify the situation, the project leaders included an extra reference to the brand of the NPO within the booklet both in the acknowledgement section and beside the borrowed resource. Due to the scale of the pilot project, this was not a major issue; however, if the project were to be rolled out nationwide, the issue of branding would have further intensified. The communications manager would not have permitted so many logos on a resource as it diluted the brand. As safefood paid for the pilot initiative, it was important that the organisation’s branding was highly visible.

This MOU was never amended or signed by either party during the project, instead process evaluations, email communications and meetings from minutes were used to keep track of arrangements. The project leader apologised to the NGO’s representative in person at the next available opportunity and they were satisfied with the steps taken to rectify the situation and the issue was never mentioned again. The focus returned to the implementation of the pilot initiative.

This discussion identified the key characteristics of one of the categories of partners in the GYLG pilot initiative. The next section discusses the second category, the campaign implementation partners. The content of the following section diverges from strategic decision making to the implementation of the campaign.

4.6 Campaign Implementation Partners

The second category of partnership was tasked with operationalising the key elements of the GYLG pilot initiative and actually implementing the strategy. The
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selection process for this category differed slightly from the external advisory group as they had different goals. The external group were tasked with the decision-making processes and strategy development; the implementation partners were primarily utilised as intermediaries for the execution of the GYLG pilot initiative. To implement the GYLG pilot initiative the partners needed to recruit workplaces to support the project. Three were recruited, Pilot Site A (PS A) were also represented on the external advisory group; they suggested the initiative incorporated service stations, proposing the potential of working with Pilot Site B. Pilot Site C (PS C) was identified as a possible partner during the formative research. These partners are referred to as pilot sites A, B and C throughout this case study to protect their identities. A summary of these pilot sites profile is provided in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Profile of Pilot Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of site and location</th>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PS A Logistical distribution centre, Belfast | Access to approximately 100 drivers through direct and indirect employees  
Health checks: Took place in two of the boardrooms on-site |
| PS B Service station              | Parking for up to 20 trucks, located in the docklands therefore was popular with drivers travelling to and from the ferries, also part of an industrial estate therefore were popular with ‘local’ drivers who worked in the area  
Health Checks: Mobile units were rented and placed within 100 yards of the truck park due to space restrictions inside the service station |
| PS C Service station and restaurant, outside of Dublin, ROI | Parking for up to 50 trucks at once, showering facilities for drivers, large variety of foods; offers hot dinners in the restaurant and an extensive deli counter range  
Health Checks: One large function room within the restaurant was rented and two ‘rooms’ were created using rented partitions |

The characteristics of each site differed slightly, however the prerequisite of having access and reach to the truck driving audience remained the same for each. This section will discuss the selection process and dominant partnership characteristics for each pilot site partner separately.
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4.6.1 Pilot Site A Selection Process

As previously suggested, during the formative stages of this workplace initiative the support of employers within the industry was identified as a priority. By achieving approval from gatekeepers within the truck driver community such as drivers who could influence other and employers within the industry, it was felt by the project leaders that the legitimacy of the pilot initiative would increase. Prior to the selection of the partners within this category an industry analysis was conducted to comprehend the size and types of distribution (trucking/haulage) companies that were established on the IOI. This assessment process proved difficult due to a lack of an available database on the size of the industry or a willingness within the industry associations to assist. Industry associations that were perceived to hold this type of information were contacted for assistance. However, the one association that was deemed most knowledgeable and influential required a monetary transaction in exchange for a copy of their database. Others simply did not retain the information we required.

“I phoned the *** today for assistance profiling the trucking industry. They were not willing to volunteer any information on the size of the industry however offered to sell me their database containing a list of their members for over €1000; alternatively I could pay for a subscription which would allow me access to the members section of this website. Both options were not suitable at this time as we did not know exactly the type of initiative we were developing and it was a lot of money to invest to scope out the industry...” (Except from researchers diary 26/08/2008)

As a result, the project leaders manually compiled lists of trucking companies, which were amalgamated from various sources already in the public domain, such as the Golden Pages and industry association websites (See Figure 4.3). They also contacted the agencies responsible for distributing the licenses to truck drivers for statistics on the industry and during this time the project leaders attended truck shows. As an outcome of this analysis a rough estimate of the size of the industry and potential partner pool materialised.
Neither safefood nor their external partners on this pilot initiative had previous experience engaging with this industry sector and as a result found it difficult to ascertain how to begin the process to gain access. The industry profile identified that operations ranged in size from small to large enterprises and spanned from regional to multi-national companies. To aid in this decision making process, safefood enlisted their existing stakeholder networks to request assistance from sources who had more experience within the industry.

Pilot site A’s participation was recommended by a past member of safefood’s Advisory Board Committee (See Figure 3.4 for role in safefood’s activities) who had previously interacted with the firm. This recommendation from a trusted reliable source had a number of implications. safefood was more eager and willing to begin a consultation or negotiation process into the firm’s involvement in the project as they had at least an idea of their business acumen. However, simultaneously the project leaders were conscious that unlike the members selected to participate in the external advisory group, due to the commercial orientation of the firm, value congruence between the two organisations was not high, neither was a sense of a common purpose. This realisation shifted the focus to an alternative set of value propositions that could catalyse commitment to the project and still fulfil the needs of both the pilot initiative and the firms. The types of benefits for truck driver
employers that needed to be effectively reinforced included increased efficiencies, reductions in employee absenteeism and positive health and safety implications.

“**suggested the benefits of emphasising the ‘health’ component in and safety – an area that is often overlooked - as a means of enticing companies to participate, rewards included efficiencies and cost saving related to reductions in absenteeism...” (Excerpt from personal notes taken during the first external advisory group meeting 03/12/2008)

As a result of this pre-established line of communication, the Advisory Board Committee member initiated contact with Pilot Site A on behalf of safefood. This step overcame a huge barrier by building on existing relationships as opposed to initiating a new one which was a more time consuming and resource intensive process. This advisory board member was also able to reassure the commercial firm’s management of the motivations of safefood whilst also empathising the benefits of participating in the pilot initiative.

As a commercial firm, pilot site A’s interests were profit driven and therefore initially their strategic fit with the issue of male obesity may not be obvious. Conversely, as a successful multinational corporation, the culture within this organisation was to nurture the wellbeing of their employees and this sentiment was indirectly connected with the issue of obesity. They also monitored the health of their employees routinely on an annual basis and had previously attempted to introduce a well being programme.

“Pilot site A do not have a full time occupational health officer, however, they do use an external occupational health company and distribute occupational health questionnaires annually which are assessed. If any problems relating to health are noted drivers are asked to see an occupational health nurse”. (Excerpt from initial meeting minute with pilot site A’s manager 03/09/2009)

Consequently, by tackling the issue of obesity within the workplace they could also impact on other issues that affected their working life such as stress, fatigue and
complications such as Type II diabetes, sleep apnoea and psychological issues (Roberts and York J. 2000; De Souza and Ciclitiva 2005). From this perspective, there was convergence between the aim of the GYLG project and the mission of the company. For this reason, the representative of this partnership (pilot site A) was also invited to participate on the initiatives external advisory group as a partner who could represent the wellbeing of the drivers within the initiative.

Now that a background to the selection process of pilot site A has been established the dominant characteristics of this partnership will be discussed in the following sections.

4.6.2 Managing Roles and Expectations

After *safefood*‘s Advisory Board member had initiated contact with a senior executive in pilot site A, the firm appointed a representative (managerial level) who was invited to participate on the GYLG pilot initiatives external advisory group which would inform the strategic direction of the initiative. The original contact in pilot site A delegated this task to one of the organisations managers. After the initial meeting of the external advisory group in December of 2008 which he actively participated in; communication between *safefood* and the pilot site representative dwindled, with telephone calls and emails remaining unanswered. During this period the project leaders became increasingly nervous and frustrated in relation to the lack of contact. This lack of dialogue slowed the progress of planning the initiative and raised questions relating to the commitment of this potential partner. This formative phase of the pilot initiative needed to be completed in consultation with the pilot partner as they were in control of what was and was not feasible on their site.

“I have rang pilot site A on countless occasions with no response, emails continue to go unanswered. Three months has lapsed without any correspondence which is making me nervous and I am beginning to question their level of commitment to the entire project. I am going to arrange a meeting with my director to reassess the situation- we have invested time and
After months of limited communication, it took one phone call from the M&C Director within safefood to the original contact for pilot site A to get them to recommit to the project. The task of coordinating the pilot initiative within pilot site A was reassigned to two different managers and a face-to-face planning meeting was rescheduled for the following week. This scenario reinforced the importance of senior management’s support within initiatives and choosing the correct people within partner organisations to manage the project.

This outcome was successful in alleviating some of the nervousness associated with the lack of communication with the partnering firm. The project leaders still saw the value of partnering with this firm; however, from the project leader’s perspective the level of trust had diminished due to this lack of correspondence. Before the project leaders had fully committed to rolling out the project on this site (i.e. allocating the budget), they sought reassurances that pilot site A fully understood the expectations relating to this project.

- **SD and MH are meeting two representatives from pilot site A on Tues 03 March at their offices in Belfast.**
- **SD has been trying to arrange this meeting since 03 November when the representative from pilot site A agreed to same at the External Group Meeting. ** finally made contact with original contact in pilot site A and secured this meeting.
- **The purpose and format of the meeting was discussed. It was agreed that it is vital that a strong case is provided for the programme at the meeting and that pilot site A get a clear sense of what will be involved from a research and pilot perspective.**

(Excerpt from internal meeting minutes 26/02/2009)

As the project leaders were meeting with two new representatives who had not attended any prior meetings with safefood this meeting was an opportunity to reinforce the value propositions for both entities as well as scope out the resources
the pilot site had to make changes. This meeting was quite formal; the organisation even provided lunch for the project leaders. The pilot site representatives were enthusiastic about the pilot initiative and proposed some good ideas about how best to implement the project and recruit participants. As an outcome of the meeting a verbal agreement of what was expected from both parties. These expectations were recorded within minutes that were circulated between both parties. For example:-

- **Pilot site A agreed to provide 15-20 local distribution drivers to take part in preliminary research. This research could take place in their offices and they agreed to provide a room for the research to take place. They would schedule drivers to take part over a one-day period. They also highlighted that the research would have to take place when they are in the depot with their working hours usually from 2am to 10pm. They felt it would be more difficult for them to recruit long haul drivers as we may have longer waiting period. As a solution they posed that most of the shorter haul drivers would have worked as a long haul driver at some point so they could discuss this experience during the interview.** (Extract from minutes with pilot site A 03/03/2012)

From this point, commitment to the project was assessed by the researcher by their adequately fulfilling the allocated roles and responsibilities. At times, however, the level of commitment was difficult to measure as some circumstances were beyond the control of the pilot site managers for example weather, traffic and staff shortages.

**“PS A: There were management, administration, and logistical issues in the depot due to staff shortages which had a major impact on the support given to the researchers and also the amount of drivers available to participate”**. (Excerpt from process evaluation 28/10/2009).

In other instances, it was difficult to differentiate where the breakdown occurred. In one encounter, during the formative research, although the project leaders had tried to plan a research schedule, the number of driver participants fell below expectations. When looking around the depot, drivers did seem to be present
however; a comprehensive reason for non-participation was never communicated. At a later stage, during an informal conversation with one of the truck drivers it became apparent that Pilot Site A were in the process of implementing a new alcohol and drug testing policy which had caused discontent with the drivers. The driver suggested that this could have been a reason for the driver’s reluctance to participate.

From the outset of the partnership process the project leaders explicitly expressed their expectations and assigned roles, which were agreed by both parties, the project leaders also reinforced these expectations throughout. However, some tasks never came into fruition. In the example below, the recruitment letter was not circulated to the driver in a reasonable timeframe, they were given to the drivers on the day as opposed to a week in advance and the pilot site managers were unable to provide a timetable of the driver’s schedules as they were thought to fluctuate:

- Need to recruit 25 drivers- mixture of long and short haul driving experience
- As we are paying a research company we need assurances that there are enough drivers scheduled to participate in the research. We need to account for drivers not showing up due to delays etc so if possible could you arrange for 25 drivers to be available over the two nights.
- We will forward you a recruitment letter to give to the driver
- Drivers need to be informed of the location and time of their interview in advance of the date scheduled (Extract from minutes with pilot site A 07/04/2009)

During various conversations both face-to-face and over-the-telephone conversations the pilot site A’s representatives identified the necessity for a “boundary spanner” within the organisation to help with recruitment. This individual was liked and trusted by the employees and could actively motivate drivers in a non-coercive manner to participate in the initiative. This individual had regular day-to-day contact with the drivers enjoying the ‘banter’ with the drivers, was accepted as a peer as he was not in a senior position in the organisation and was responsible for training the drivers.
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Pilot site A representatives were clear of the times and dates that the GYLG pilot initiative would launch as they had assisted in scheduling the initiative during a period that was manageable in the organisation. However, this boundary spanner’s schedule was not completely free to assist recruitment on these days. The driver trainer was available for a small proportion of the shift and during this time there was a positive increase in recruitment. When he was reassigned to complete other tasks recruitment fell. From conversations with Pilot Site A, the project leaders had communicated an expectation that there would be someone within the firm available to assist with recruitment. However, as the management did not want the project to interfere with the operations of the company, this expectation could not be fulfilled on their behalf. To compensate for poor recruitment levels, for example during the formative research, the pilot representatives were amenable to rescheduling, however, the costs were incurred by safefood were perceived as greater than the organisations inconvenience.

4.6.3 Formal Agreements

Although the project leaders had kept minutes as a formal record of discussions and decisions, the need for a MOU with PSA was continuously debated between the project leaders. When the planning of the pilot initiative was progressing favourably, the need for such a formal agreement diminished, when it was not, the need for a formal contract increased as the level of trust decreased. This document would reinforce safefood’s and their partner’s roles and responsibilities whilst also emphasize an awareness of the substantial monetary and non-monetary investment that was made in the initiative by all parties involved.

A draft of this agreement was written to be co–signed by the managers who were coordinating the project in pilot site A and the Chief Executive in safefood, again as a symbol of commitment to the GYLG pilot initiative. Similarly to the MOU drafted between the project leaders and the advisory group member, the draft document clearly outlined how tasks were managed within the partnership and the distribution of the roles and responsibilities for the duration of the project. In the opening sentence of this agreement as shown below, the relationship between the partner and safefood was clearly stated through the inclusion of the word collaboration, closely
followed by the term partnership, in the following paragraph. This instilled a sense of ownership and investment in the pilot initiative and the sharing of responsibility.

“It is agreed that safefood and Pilot Site A\textsuperscript{7} will work collaboratively on the Get Your Life into Gear pilot...” (Except from Pilot Site A MOU 07/08/2009)

Although pilot site A had verbalised that they were committed to the initiative, at times their representatives became difficult to contact and engage with. As communication between the two partners diminished for the second period during the relationship so did the level of trust between the project leaders and the pilot site coordinators. This time, the non-communication was attributed to the increasing workloads of pilot site A’s representative. As the pilot site A representatives continued to be nonresponsive, the intensity of attempts to communicate by the project leaders increased. Phone calls emerged as the preferred form of communication with the pilot site representatives as the project leader felt this was the most efficient medium for receiving a response to queries. During this period, the project leader was also conscious that too much contact, particularly enquiring over trivial matters, could be construed as a nuisance and reduce motivation of the pilot site representatives to participate.

“... *** has become continuing distracted, email communication is becoming less frequent and once I could finally reach him he was too busy to talk and we arranged for him to call when he was free. This call was never returned. I need to talk to ** and ** about how best to communicate with him as there is no explanation as to what the issue is – at this stage I am assuming it is workloads” (Extract from field notes 10/07/2009)

As suggested, the MOU between safefood and pilot site A, was not drafted at the beginning of the relationship as a clear record of activities were keep through meeting minutes to monitor the situation. Instead it emerged approximately three months into the partnership negotiations in reaction to non-cooperation and non-

\textsuperscript{7} The name of the partner organisation has been changed to protect their identities
communication on behalf of Pilot Site A. This document symbolised an attempt to alleviate a growing anxiety that the project leaders were experiencing. Tension was arising due to differing values and work priorities between the two organisations. The GYLG pilot initiative was a priority for *safefood* and therefore time and other resources were constantly available to the project leaders.

These negative experiences caused the project leaders to interpret the pilot sites commitment to the project as secondary to their operations. This acceptance also diminished the level of trust in the relationship. In reality, pilot site A’s operations were being effected by external factors beyond the control of the project leaders, most notably the current economic recession and the increase in fuel prices which increased the cost of doing business. Also, as a result of seasonality of their work at different points throughout the year, for example, January and Easter, the workload for the pilot site managers would increase and during these times the quality and frequency of information sharing and overall cooperation did diminish.

“Next Thursday will be as good a day as any. Not near the beginning of the month so should not be as busy as the last time...” (Email Correspondence between Pilot Site A and project leader 14/05/2009).

“...Peter* has been on hols and the new store opening meant everyone was on overdrive however it has settled down now and we can move forward with yourselves” (Email Correspondence between Pilot Site A and project leader 14/09/2009).

The project leaders were fully aware of these difficulties; however, at times the lack of communication became frustrating particularly when it was deemed unnecessary. For example, when the pilot representatives were on annual leave they did not notify the project leaders that they would be unavailable prior to departure.

These difficulties increased the necessity in the minds of the project leaders for a formal contract between the partners. The except below from the drafted

---

8 This name has been changed to protect the identity of the pilot organisation and their employees
Memorandum of Understanding highlights, safefood’s reliance on pilot site A to invest and share their resources in terms of expertise in relation to the characteristics of drivers and access to the target grouping. By encouraging pilot site A to invest in the project in terms of time and other resources it was hoped that their level of commitment would increase. In return the pilot organisation would benefit from employing a healthy workforce which could benefit them in terms of reduced sick leave and planning of operations:

“...Pilot site A’s involvement:

- Pilot site A will provide safefood with access to employees (direct and sub-contracted) for the development and trial of the pilot programme
- Pilot site A will adequately promote the programme by accommodating poster displays and leaflet distribution to drivers for the duration of the pilot
- Pilot site A will provide space on their premises to conduct health checks with participants
- Pilot site A will allow direct employees to partake in pre and post pilot health checks during work hours or alternatively will pay participants to come in early... (Excerpt from the Memorandum of Understanding with Pilot Site A 07/08/2009)

As safefood was investing in the project, this agreement also outlined the resources that they needed access to in order to succeed. Pilot site A had the ability to access the drivers and act as a gatekeeper to get them involved.

As with the previous example of the MOU, from the project leaders perspective, this document notarised what had previously been verbally agreed during various meetings throughout the process. The researchers were eager to sign this formal proclamation as a symbol of commitment to the project to ensure that there was no confusion relating to the expectation of the project. Pilot Site A’s lack of cooperation at the beginning and intermediate stages of the planning of the pilot initiative seriously impeded the progress of the initiative, as the project leaders were relying on this cooperation and had an expectation of continuance, meaning they

---

9 The name of Pilot Site A was included in the original document the name has been changed to protect their identities.
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were powerless to act in these circumstances. However, when pilot site A representatives were cooperating, they were excellent at fulfilling tasks and assisting in the planning and implementation of the project. It was this realisation that led to the document never being signed. The MOU was shown to the pilot site A representatives within months of the planned launched, simultaneously the work load for the pilot representatives had diminished and they were available to participate. During the lead up to the launch they worked hard to make it a success through internal communications requesting staff to become campaign ambassadors, distributing the posters and being available onsite to assist the project leaders.

"Dear All

safe\textit{food} is a North-South body, responsible for the promotion of food safety on the island of Ireland. It was established in 1999 under the terms of the British-Irish Agreement Act 1999 and the North-South Co-operation (Implementation Bodies) Northern Ireland Order 1999,...

One of their areas of concern is the health of Truck Drivers and they are rolling out a campaign to promote a healthier lifestyle to them...

...Posters and leaflets will be put up in various parts of the site first thing tomorrow and if you are talking to drivers or hauliers please promote this worthwhile programme to them". (Internal email communications circulated to all staff by the Pilot Site A representative prior to launch, 28/09/09)

As all parties were now cooperating within the partnership the necessity of such a document diminished and the implementation of the pilot initiative became the focal point of discussions once again. The lack of such agreements has been considered a limitation of partnership working within the social marketing literature (Bentz, Dorfman \textit{et al.} 2005). However, the experiences within this case study suggest the necessity depends on the circumstances surrounding the partnership.

Overall the pilot site did fulfil the major obligations it agreed to within the project. However, differing priorities in terms of the implementation of the pilot initiative did lead to difficulties within the relationship. \textit{safe\textit{food}} was tasked with rolling out the project, pilot site A were tasked with facilitating it, if such a partnership was to arise again greater time would be taken at the beginning of the relationship to encourage
investment. For example, a bigger PR drive within the organisation and their network of sub contracted drivers. Pilot site A did invest in the project in terms of their amenability to letting their drivers participate however, a greater investment would be a further symbol of commitment and trust to the relationship.

4.6.4 Service Station Partners

Formative research (in-depth interviews and focus groups) with truck drivers on the IOI reinforced the difficulties of engaging with this workforce. This formative research identified that truck drivers spent little time in a static ‘workplace’ and the drivers remained unsure whether their employer would value such an initiative (See Appendix A for a summary). The research suggested that only a limited number of companies would have the capabilities or willingness to implement a workplace programme of this type.

“Tier One: Large Well Resourced Employers

These are reputable employers who behave responsibly towards employees, providing benefits, health & safety information & training and other forms of employee support”(Except from formative research report July 2009).

The formative research confirmed that as a movable workforce, opportunities to access and engage with truck drivers within a conventional ‘workplace’ (i.e. office setting) were rare, therefore optimising alternative points of contact became increasingly essential.

“Drivers were highly sceptical about the level of interest from their employers in offering such a programme, adamant that anything that would cost either money or time would be rejected. Most felt that in order to reach all drivers, any such initiative would need to be rolled out independently of the workplace, for example via motorway service organisations” (Except from formative research report July 2009).

This issue of access had also been raised during the second external advisory group meeting.
“CD asked whether there was scope to move the programme from workplace based to environmental – work with service stations rather than employers. SafeFood are open to working in a broader scope then the direct immediate workplace of the drivers.” (Except from external meeting minutes 25/06/2009).

Partnership selection remained strategic ensuring that the chosen partners had the highest impact and reach; which was equated to making product and service offerings available at a time and location convenient to the truck drivers.

“SD discussed other possibilities of communicating with the drivers. The managers suggested that drivers would use the same service areas on their routes although the facilities suitable for truck drivers on the island are sparse...” (Except from initial meeting with managers of Pilot Site A 03/03/2009)

Based on this insight, service stations emerged as a favourable option for accessing truck drivers. Service stations offered potential for a direct marketing campaign, for example, positioning prompts at the fuel pumps and in store promotions however, as the budget for the pilot initiative was cut the scale of the promotional activities surrounding it were also decreased. Also, during the discussion relating to service stations within the formative research, the drivers articulated only a few stations were perceived to value truck drivers as customers through their provision of parking and showers. The choice of suitable service station partners therefore had the potential to greatly impact on the strategic direction of the pilot initiative as well as the external partners decision-making processes.

The most obvious difference between partners pilot sites A, B and C (see Table 4.3 for pilot site profile) was that pilot site A was a distribution centre and pilot sites B and C were service stations that catered for truck drivers through the provision of products and services. By partnering with two different ‘workplace’ settings the pilot initiative planners could assess the viability of implementing the campaign within both environments; one incorporating employer support within the initiative, the other less structured and more reliant on the driver’s willingness to engage in the pilot.
The employers in pilot site A were more involved in the planning process than the service station managers. This involvement resulted from being identified at an early stage in the planning process therefore the project leaders had more time to engage with the organisations representatives. These representatives were also supportive and enthusiastic towards the project. The project leaders regretted not actively involving the managers in pilot sites B and C in the planning process however; because of time constraints this was not possible. By the time these additional partners were identified a lot of the strategic and design decisions had already been made. Also, the managers of pilot sites B and C were willing to participate in the pilot but did not exhibit the same level of interest or enthusiasm to participate. This perspective was deemed acceptable by the project leaders, as pilot sites B and C were viewed as necessary intermediaries and the GYLG partners needed access to the drivers.

The identification process for Pilot site B and C was less formal then the other partners. The manager of pilot site A recommended pilot site B as a service station that was readily frequented by truck drivers due to its location and the services it provided (parking and quality food). Although positioned in close proximity, Pilot sites A and B were completely independent of each other. Pilot site C was selected in consultation with the target audience through formative research (See Appendix A), the results of which indicated a necessity for any successful programme to meet the truck drivers at a time and a place that was convenient to them. Pilot site C was explicitly identified within this research as offering good food at cheap prices that encouraged repeat business by the truck drivers.

It is again acknowledged that as a commercial firm, value congruence with the issue of obesity may be low amongst service station managers or even perceived as a conflict of interest given the products they supply. However, the findings of the formative research identified that truck drivers had a positive pre-established relationship with these firms. These services were well respected and utilised by the trucking industry because of the unique facilities they offered on the IOI such as showers, adequate parking, and the wide range of food they offered from snacks to hot foods. With this type of partner, the welfare of the customer and incentive for repeat purchases as a result of their perceived efforts to promote the well-being of
drivers became the motivator for engagement between the GYLG partners and the service stations. By partnering on such a programme the company were perceived to value the welfare of their customers which could manifest as a key competency when competing for trade amongst other service stations.

The following section will discuss the key characteristics of the two pilot site partners.

**4.6.4.2 Pilot Site B**

The first contact was made with pilot site B by visiting the forecourt and arranging a meeting with the manager. This manager was immediately amendable to the idea of the pilot initiative and spent a considerable length of time showing the project leaders around the facilities:

- **MH introduced the project to PH. From this brief intro various points of contact with the customer and areas of consideration were highlighted.**
- **The manager acknowledged that he would be happy to facilitate any program that would encourage more truck drivers to visit the shop.**

**Areas of Consideration**

- **The Manager happy to promote the healthy option where ever possible. He agreed that he would facilitate extra signage and putting additional labels on the sandwiches made on site that were considered healthy options. PM was eager to promote the use of his deli bar and indicated that they were in the process of changing their hot foods menu. (Minutes from meeting with Pilot Site B manager 27/08/2008)**

The project leaders were astounded at how easy it was to recruit the service station to participate; the managers (two brothers) had recently taken over the business and were keen to develop it. After this initial meeting the manager of pilot site B assisted in the pretesting of materials prior to the launch. Communication with this partner was predominantly coordinated via telephone or face-to-face contact. Conversations over the phone were brief and to the point, the manager was usually
agreeable to how the strategy was to be implemented and did not ask many questions or make many requests. As a result of their close proximity to pilot site A it was easier for the project leaders to ‘drop in’ to the premises to discuss the implementation of the project, particularly nearer the launch.

During the negotiations a number of responsibilities were assigned to this pilot site manager to increase the cooperation of efforts. They were requested to put up posters, distribute leaflets, provide/donate water and assist in the setting up of the premises and brief staff. None of these tasked were fulfilled adequately. After several phone calls posters had still not been displayed, the manager indicated that the staff were too busy so the project leaders took responsibility for putting them up. In relation to the bottled water, the economic recession had started to impact on their business between the initial meeting and the launch of the project.

“This service station showed great potential for the initiative in terms of access to the drivers and working with the station to offer healthier choices. However the place is wall to wall confectionery! The manager was quite enthusiastic, the recession was beginning to have an impact on trade and he was willing to try anything to draw in the custom.” (Diary excerpt 27/08/2008)

The pilot site managers could no longer afford to freely distribute water, however, did provide it at wholesale price. In this case, the external environment, particularly the recession, had greatly impacted on their commitment to the project due to the strain on their business which in turn changed their priorities. However, the tasks that did not require any investment apart from a limited allocation of time were also not fulfilled. These simple tasks included briefing staff and keep parking places for the health check trailers.

- **PS B- SD visited the service station to speak with the Manager; he was unavailable and SD was asked to call back after 2.30. SD rang the manager in the afternoon asked him to confirm the location for the trailers and requested that space would be reserved for them in the morning. SD**
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requested that the morning staff should be informed of what was taking place and support the team throughout the three days

• PS B- As this was the first day at the service station it took longer to position and set up trailers - space was not reserved for trailers so SD had to request that staff members move their cars before set up could commence (Excerpt from Pilot Site B process evaluation 28/10/2009)

This lack of cooperation on the first day resulted in missed opportunities to recruit drivers. It also resulted in the diminished trust and perceived commitment to the project. To counteract this negative impact the project leaders arrived at the pilot site earlier to assist in the set up.

At the end of the launch there was no discussion of continuing with the project, on the final day recruitment had been slow due to torrential rain and the manager perceived this to be a lack of success. He did not comment on the previous two busy days. Once the project leaders had cleared up their materials they sought out the manager. He had not engaged much with the initiative over the last three days. During this conversation he expressed his concern about the impact the recession was having on his business and did not invite the project leaders back to repeat the initiative. They did return however, as previously agreed, for the follow up health checks three months later. During the follow up health checks the service station was visibly quieter, with fewer trucks parking up and less of a lunch time rush. The drivers who did return for their follow up assessment were grateful for the opportunity and valued how convenient it was for them. Once the pilot initiative had finished, the manager of pilot site B received an evaluation report via email, however this was not acknowledged.

4.6.4.2 Pilot Site C

Pilot site C was composed of two inter related businesses, a service station and restaurant which were managed separately but were part of the same franchise. The managers of both establishments were contacted via telephone and with little difficulty; a meeting was arranged the same week which both managers in
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attendance. The first meeting was arranged on their premises, as were all consecutive meetings, the purpose of which was to introduce the pilot site to the GYLG pilot initiative. As the planning and launch in Northern Ireland was already underway, the project leader provided a clear overview of the project and what they expected from the pilot site who hosted the pilot initiative. This meeting was also arranged to garner the complementary resources that the pilot site C could offer the pilot initiative to improve its efficiency.

From the outset the service station manager was more enthusiastic towards the initiative than the restaurant manager - evident from their body language, tone and the questions that were asked. Both managers were new to the franchise, with the service station manager in particular communicating a willingness to try anything to increase the retention of his customers during the current recession.

“The meeting today with the managers was very productive and there is an agreement in principle to pilot the GYLG initiative on the premises. This was agreed by both managers; one however, was more reserved and was concerned about the investment he would have to make in terms of time... The other manager did not express any difficulty and indicated he was willing to try anything if it brought custom into the store”. (Diary extract 25 October 2009)

The restaurant manager was less enthusiastic; he was newer in his position and had agreed in principle to participate however, he made it explicit that the management of his premises was his priority.

Due to spacing and costing issues, the health checks were to be held on the restaurant premises in a rented function room. The project leader requested a discount which was rejected. As a result of the current economic climate preference would be given to those paying for services which could have resulted in the rescheduling of the health checks. As a consequence of renting the room in the restaurant, the project leader communicated more frequently with the restaurant manager than his service station colleague. These conversations, often over the phone were fragmented and often resulted in a request for the project leader to ring back at a more convenient
time. Both managers were involved in determining the best time to launch the health checks and the best way to recruit drivers.

At the initial meeting where the roles and responsibilities of the project were discussed, the managers in site C specifically requested that they would communicate the initiative to their staff. Following recommendations in the workplace literature a sign of organisation commitment is to communication across and between levels of staff of the organisation. This included seeking the franchise owner’s permission to launch the initiative on their premises.

“...Buy-in from management and employees are essential to project progression.” (Except from Internal group meeting 12/09/2008 discussing the pre-formative research)

The project leaders encouraged the pilot site manager to communicate the rationale and terms of the pilot initiative to all staff who could potentially act as ambassadors or promoters of the project to the drivers.

4.6.4.2.1 Consequences of miscommunication

On at least one occasion, tension manifested as an outcome of diminished trust between partners. This concept is best illustrated by an episode within pilot site C. On the first evening of the project launch the project leader experienced a disagreement with the owner of the franchise as explained in the following extract.

“Tonight at the project launch the owner of the service station expressed her concern to what she referred to as a conflict of interest between what we were doing and her organisational goals i.e. profitability particularly in the times that were in it...I was very uncomfortable working there for the remainder of the evening, no one had been informed of what was happening or the reason for our presence, there was a noticeable lack of trust from the staff and our morale had dropped significantly”. (Excerpt from researchers diary 3/11/2009)
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The franchise owner had arrived on site and was greeted by one of the recruiters at the door. On entering the premises the kitchen staff, particularly the chef, was disgruntled that we were recruiting outside the dining area. Staff had not been briefed on the initiative or told that it was launching on the premises; although posters advertising the project were displayed on the doors entering the premises none of the staff had questioned what the project was about. The lack of communication from their manager meant that staff felt threatened by the initiative as they did not understand what it was about. They believed the health checks would encourage the drivers not to eat in their premises, which could in turn impact on their job security. The current economic climate across the island of Ireland was impacting on the profitability of small businesses. This except shows the difficulties that arise when goal convergence is low and tension arises.

After receiving the complaints from staff, the franchise manager was also of the opinion that the recruiters were deterring patrons from entering the premises. She also felt undermined that a consultation process had not taken place to request the usage of the restaurant premises to launch the initiative. She was unaware of the several meetings that took place between the project leaders and the restaurant manager, or that he had granted permission for the launch. Unfortunately, the restaurant manager was not on site that night to diffuse the situation. This encounter had the potential to jeopardise the entire project as the service stations were utilised as a point of access to the target audience. Once the franchise manager realised the restaurant manager had given permission to recruit on the premises, the franchise owner allowed the recruitment to continue, however, the future of the project remained uncertain.

When the project leader telephoned the service station manager the following morning he had not been briefed on the events that unfolded the previous evening. He was confident that the situation could be managed and preferred to speak to his superiors directly. Once he had communicated the potential added value of the pilot initiative for the premises it was allowed to continue. However, the recruiters continued to feel uncomfortable working on site. As a result of this encounter, it took longer for the project leaders to gain permission to hold the second phase of the health checks which this time were sanctioned by the site owners.
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At least three attempts were made to resolve the issues all of which were instigated by *safefood*. The first attempt occurred the day following the incident. The acting Director of M&C in *safefood* attempted to telephone the franchise owner, however she was unavailable to take his call. Within the same week, a letter was sent to the service station owner to initiate a meeting between *safefood* and the franchise. No one responded to this correspondence. The final attempt was made approximately three months after the incident when the Director of M&C returned from leave. This letter thanked the organisation for supporting the initiative and requested a meeting between the parties involved. This letter also received no reply.

“I am writing to you from *safefood* regarding your partnership with us on the ‘Get your life in Gear’ project. I have been on maternity leave for the last 6 months and have just returned to work… Sinead indicated that a few concerns arose in the rolling out of the first phase of the project and I would welcome a meeting with you and your colleagues so we can sit down and resolve any issues you may have…” (Except from letter sent to senior management 27/01/2010)

It was in the best interests of all involved in the pilot initiative to diffuse tension and conflict quickly. Management of tension would ensure that the positive reputations of all partners would be maintained and that trust was rebuilt which would ensure the continuance of the project. *safefood* also valued the relationship that had been developing with the organisation and would have liked to have maintained it in the future.

These experiences had a number of implications for partnership development. This scenario reinforced the need for shared values and communication to penetrate at every level of the organisation. This idea had been discussed within the project and the pilot site C manager had assumed responsibility for its implementation, however this task was not fulfilled.

- *PS C Gatekeeper no 1* met with *SD* to discuss room layout and *safefood*’s needs during the 3 days on the 21st of October 2009. *He agreed to brief staff members on the project and ask for their support*
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- *SD requested that the pilot organisations restaurant staff continually remind direct and indirect employees about the health checks that were being offered on site and support the program...* (Except from PS3 planning meeting 29/10/2009)

If support was achieved, the staff could have acted as ambassadors for the campaign, enhancing visibility and credibility. However, all the blame cannot be positioned in one direction either, the project leaders should have insisted on holding a briefing session with all staff at every level to ensure that this scenario did not materialise.

On review of this partnership, and the others within this category the definition of the term could be revisited. The project leaders believed that the pilot site managers were partners; however, their actions did not always live up to the expectations of the project leaders. These transaction orientated partners did not share the same values as the external advisory group partners, although they did potentially benefit from participation through the revenue generated by retention of customers. At times their level of cooperation was also low, in terms of fulfilling their roles and responsibilities and the sharing of resources. As a result trust and commitment between the project leaders and the pilot site organisations was low. Pilot site A was an exception; they invested more in terms of time and sharing of resources during the planning stages.

On reflection, the project could not have been implemented without the assistance of these organisations. This analysis brings into question the differentiation between a partner and an intermediary. As well as having the dominating characteristics previously discussed, the partner makes an investment in the relationship and commits to making it work. The intermediary merely facilitates the initiative with little input. The example of the bottle water helps explain this scenario. All pilot site managers were requested to supply water for the initiative and all agreed on principle. At the project launch only one site provided water for free, one had not been able to access some and due to a decrease in profitability the third pilot site manager was only able to provide it at cost price. All pilot site managers had difficulty making this small investment in the project. Posters were another issue, putting up the posters in view of their customers was another symbol of commitment.
to the project, posters were extremely important within this campaign as they increased the visibility. Before launch it was identified that posters in Pilot site B and C had not been displayed as agreed. This further eroded the level of trust the safefood project leaders had with these partners and from this point the safefood project leaders took over the responsibility of the launch of the campaign. Pilot site A had fulfilled their commitments to his task.

As an outcome of this discussion of all the categories of partner, the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships that were evident within the case study will be discussed in the final section.

4.7 Summary of Key Characteristics of social marketing partnerships

4.7.1 Relationship Commitment and Trust

This case study identified an inextricable link between relationship commitment and trust. Both were identified as essential to the development of partnership relations however, it was observed that trust acted as a precursor to commitment. Trust within the case was associated with the reliability and predictability of the partner to act as they were expected to. When the level of trust diminished within the relationship, for instance a partner were perceived to be unreliable, the level of commitment to the partnership was questioned. However, as the level of trust increased so did the assumed commitment to the partnership or project.

The type of partner involved in the pilot initiative or its organisational culture also impacted on the level of trust. Partners who had a pre-established relationship with the project leaders were already considered as trustworthy as their reactions to different circumstances could be anticipated or predicted. This trustworthiness therefore had already manifested over time as the relationship matured. For organisations/individuals who did not have this foundation when entering the partnership, however, were from similar sectors (i.e. the public sector or NGO), the level of existing trust was still high. Their reputations as organisations preceded them and their shared values with an issue also acted as a precursor to trust. The level of pre-established trust with firms from different sectors particularly the public
is more difficult to assess. A certain level of trust with the firm was garnered by their willingness to participate in the pilot initiative; however, this level of pre-established trust was significantly lower within the commercial firms. Time was needed to establish a trust worthy relationship. It was also easier for the actions of commercial firms to corrode trust due to the uncertainty of their behaviours. Once diminished it was much harder to build the levels of trust back up to pre-established levels and therefore stay committed to the relationship.

_safefood_ wholly funded this project therefore symbols of commitment from pilot partners and the external partners manifested in different ways. Commitment was symbolised by the following through of these actions and fulfilling the partner’s expectations of the relationship. It was assessed through the level of investment the partners made in the pilot initiative. Investment in this sense relates to tangible and intangible resources and the following through of actions that had been agreed upon. Symbols of commitment to the partnership ranged again depending on the type of partner from permission to use resources to recruiting drivers to participate in the project. It also centred on communicating that the partnership was of importance to the partner. Trust was identified as a driver of commitment as those who were considered trust worthy partners were also identified to be committed to the initiative.

Within the GYLG case study trust and commitment did not manifest in isolation. There were three antecedents and three consequences that were associated with it. The antecedents will be discussed first.

### 4.7.2 Mutual Benefit

Every partner within the case study was shown to benefit tangibly or intangibly from participation. When the perceived benefits for participating did not exist partners became less committed to the change endeavours. Where shared values between the cause, organisation and the partner do not directly converge; as observed with some private partners acting as intermediaries, it was the mutually beneficial aspect of the relationship that facilitated the longevity of the relationship. As described within the case, although _safefood_ were not motivated by profit by partnering with
organisations within the initiative they were able to achieve their organisational objectives and counteract a resource deficit within their organisation.

### 4.7.3 Shared Values

Shared values were identified to be an essential characteristic when selecting social marketing partners. Social marketing is concerned with the betterment of the individual and society which is non monetary in nature. Where goal convergence and shared values exist, organisational cultures are thought to similar and partners adopt the same perspective of the problem. Their beliefs and value systems are also similar which makes the partnership process easier and therefore positively increases the levels of trust.

### 4.7.4 Communication

Communication was also identified to be an important yet complex variable. Positive or negative experiences of communication, or lack thereof, had the power to positively or negatively impact on the manifestation of trust. Within the case study, when the level of trust diminished, observations suggested that the frequency and formality of communications increased in an attempt to maintain the relationships. When relationships were immature meaning trust was lower, or when trust had been corroded, the type of communication that arose also became more formal in nature. This was identified in the structured approach and the type of language that was chosen. Communication between partners was managed predominantly by the project leaders, for example meeting agendas, minutes, and the accomplishment of tasks. Intercommunication between the different partnership groups did not manifest as it was perceived more manageable for the project leaders to coordinate activities with all the partners. In the majority of cases communication was usually instigated by the project leaders, however, when not it symbolised a commitment to the project. Communication was identified to be a two way process however, to avoid confusion the dialogue between categories was limited.

The importance of communication across the levels of the organisation was particularly apparent when discussing the operational partners. If this
communication process does not take place tension can manifest which in turn corrodes trust. To counteract these difficulties through active and participatory dialogue the expectations of the partnership should be clearly understood by all parties involved.

4.7.5 Cooperation

Within this case study for both categories of partnerships commitment, trust and cooperation were all interlinked. If commitment and trust were high the level of cooperation increased as an outcome of their presence. However, whenever managers failed to cooperate, their perceived level of commitment and trust diminished. Cooperation within the case was symbolised through the sharing of tangible and intangible resources. It also ranged from a willingness to discuss the strategy development of the GYLG by sharing knowledge to activities related to the operationalising of the campaign.

4.7.6 Expectation of Continuance

The literature suggests that one of the outcomes of commitment is motivation. However, the case identified that this outcome is more suited to an expectation to continue the relationship into the future. This expectation examines the likelihood of switching between problems or causes and the future development of the relationship. This concept is directly related to the commitment to the relationship. With higher commitment there is a greater likelihood of continuing the relationship into the foreseeable future.

4.7.7 Tension

Tension was identified within the case study as a negative outcome of trust. When trust corroded tension arose which lead to strain within the relationships. Tension could arise when any partner were shown to be unreliable and unpredictable. A second more positive aspect of tension which is also associated with trust is tension handling. This is the ability of the project leaders or other parties within the
partnership to diffuse contentious situations before they develop into major issues which completely impact on the partnership relations.

4.8 Chapter Overview

Within the context of this case study a number of conclusions can be made. Firstly, the term partnership remains difficult to define; however, its key characteristics or boundaries can be delineated. Partnership engagement is a deeper process than stakeholder engagement which remains an essential supporting element of change activities.

Based on the findings of this case study and the review of literature presented in Chapter 2, a eight of empirically testable research hypotheses have been devised. These hypotheses are:-

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a positive relationship between relationship benefits and relationship commitment.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a positive relationship between shared values and relationship commitment.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a positive relationship between shared values and trust.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is a positive relationship between communication and trust.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and expectation of continuance.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and cooperation.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is a positive relationship between trust and cooperation.

**Hypothesis 8:** There is a negative relationship between trust and tension.
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5.1 Introduction

The third and final phase of this research uses Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to test the proposed social marketing partnership model using which has been theoretically underpinned by the findings of phase one and phase two of this research. An overview of the overall research methodology is presented in Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1 An Overview of the Research Methodology

- **Phase 1 - Literature Review**
  - Periodisation of SM Partnerships: 3 eras Period of Coordination, Formalisation & Integration
  - Delineation of SM Partnerships
  - SM Partnership Taxonomies
  - Key Antecedents & Outcomes of SM Partnerships

- **Phase 2 - Case Study**
  - Realism as the Theoretical Framework
  - Explanatory Case Study Justification
  - Case Study Background & Introduction to GYLG Pilot Initiative
  - Data Collection Instruments, Protocols & Method
  - Case Study Analytical Framework
  - Validity & Reliability

- **Phase 3 - Structural Equation Modelling**
  - Research Hypotheses
  - SEM Theory & Implementation
  - Data Collection Method
  - Data Collection Instrument
  - Sampling
  - Fieldwork
  - SEM Data Analysis
Before the data collection procedures are described in detail the research hypotheses which guided phase three of the research are outlined below.

### 5.2 Research Hypotheses

The case study resulted in the development of eight research hypothesis as illustrated in Table 5.1. They undergo confirmatory testing through Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) within this phase of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between relationship benefits and relationship commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between shared values and relationship commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between shared values and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between communication and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and expectation of continuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between trust and cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>There is a negative relationship between trust and tension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage these hypotheses can also be represented diagrammatically as the proposed social marketing partnership model as shown in Figure 5.2. This model identifies the proposed relationships between the social marketing partnership constructs.
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As the chosen analysis technique to test this model extension, SEM has implications on the design of the data collection method, instrument, sampling strategy and fieldwork. Before these sections are discussed in detail an introduction to SEM is provided.

Figure 5.2 Proposed Key Mediating Variable Model of Social Marketing Partnerships

5.3 Structural Equation Modelling: Theory and Implementation

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) also referred to as Covariance Structure Modelling (Agresti and Finlay 2009) has grown in dominance since the early 1990’s and through its continued methodological development has been described as the preeminent multivariate data analysis technique (Hershberger 2003). Both Perry and Riege et al. (1999) and Healy and Perry (2000) argue that SEM is the primary analysis technique for those conducting research from a realist perspective. They suggest this confirmatory approach allows for the modelling of ‘complex interdependencies’ and increases the researcher’s control of measurement error (Perry, Riege et al. 1999; Healy and Perry 2000; Hunt 2010c).

SEM is important when extending this model (Figure 5.2) as it allows for the specification of relationships amongst variables (Bollen and Long 1993; Hair, Black
et al. 2006; Hoe 2008) and can test for internal consistency amongst measures (Sage 2011). Other multivariate techniques such as linear modelling, discriminant or factor analysis are less desirable as they cannot specify multivariate latent models (Stapleton 2006; Hoffman, Bynum et al. 2011) or offer the same degree of flexibility between theory and data analysis (Chin 1998). However, mistakes when implementing SEM can affect the reliability of results and impede knowledge generation (Shook, Ketchen et al. 2004).

To confirm the validity of the proposed social marketing partnership model, the internal logic of the research hypothesis was scrutinized (Hunt 2010b). As recommended by Andresen and Gerbing (1988 p.411) a two-step approach to SEM was adopted to allow the researcher to make ‘meaningful inferences about the theoretical constructs and their interrelations’. The first step used confirmatory measurement techniques to specify the relationships between the observed measures and the underlying constructs. To test the measurement model, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to assess how well the measured items represent the constructs and the relationship or correlations between them (Hair, Black et al. 2006) in preparation for the second phase. Accurate specification is a core requirement prior to the analysis of the structural model (Anderson and Gerbing 1988; Jarvis, MacKenzie et al. 2003). That is to say that convergence in measurement is a prerequisite of causal analysis (Bagozzi 1981). The second step used a confirmatory structural model to specify the causal relationships between the constructs.

Before the processes involved in preparing for SEM are discussed it is appropriate to clarify two issues. Firstly, within this research SEM is applied for theory testing as opposed to prediction, this assertion has implications for the chosen tests that will be described later within this chapter (Anderson and Gerbing 1988). Secondly, as SEM has continued to develop over the years so has the number of software packages used to conduct it; examples include LISERL, EQS, M Plus, R and AMOS. Byrne (2001) compares the approaches for testing factorial validity with LISERL, EQS and AMOS identifying the ‘critically important’ aspects of utilising each package. Although each software package may utilise slightly differing algorithms to commute model fit the end result should remain similar and not impact on conclusions drawn (Hair, Black et al. 2006). For the purpose of this research AMOS
version 18 was chosen to commute the results which is arguably a more sophisticated package than for example LISERL (Byrne 2001). The overall design of phase three of this research methodology is summarised in Figure 5.3.

Figure 5.3 Structural Equation Modelling Research Methodology Chapter Overview
5.4 Data Collection Method

The concepts that were defined within the case study and resultant relationships proposed through the research hypotheses were tested through a self-administered online survey.

5.4.1 Online Survey

The use of web based surveys has grown exponentially in the past ten years (Ganassali 2008). This growth has been driven by access to the internet, with, for example, the United Kingdom (UK) thought to have the third highest internet usage rate in Europe (Internet World Stats 2011). Web based surveys offer opportunities for collecting data for research purposes (Deutskens, Ruyter et al. 2004), however the investigation into the key characteristics of online surveys is ongoing (Cobanoglu, Warde et al. 2001).

Email surveys and web surveys share similar features, however for the purpose of this research; the online survey will be distributed in the body of an email and within an e-newsletter.

5.4.2 Advantages and Disadvantages

The advantages associated with the adoption of this methodological approach include quicker response rates and cheap administration whilst yielding satisfactory response rates (Ilieva, Baron et al. 2002; Ganassali 2008). Also, when conducting research internationally, alternative approaches such as postal questionnaires have been criticized for their low and slow response rates and the potential error that can arise from the manual coding of data (Ilieva, Baron et al. 2002). Response rates are also thought to be compatible with mail surveys (Ganassali 2008). Online surveys also offer numerous aesthetic features which ensures they are enticing for the audience.

One of the major disadvantages related to online surveys is associated with adopting a sampling strategy for example, fewer sampling frames exist for an online
population and respondents may use multiple email addresses (Bryman and Bell 2003)

5.5 Data Collection Instrument

The data collection instrument utilised within this research was an online questionnaire distributed to social marketing experts using survey monkey. Within this section a number of aspects of the questionnaire design are discussed including the measures of constructs, respondent screening questions and the overall presentation of the questionnaire. The first section discusses the procedures undertaken to select the item scales that measure the key social marketing partnership constructs. It begins with an overview of the constructs that were measured within this research.

5.5.1 Proposed Social Marketing Partnership Constructs

Morgan and Hunt’s original (1994) research modelled the relationship between twelve key mediating variables of relationship marketing. Five antecedents and five outcomes were modelled to have a positive, negative, direct or indirect effect on relationship commitment and trust within a relational exchange in a business to business setting. Figure 5.4 compares the proposed social marketing partnership model with Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original. From this illustration a number of observations can be made.

In both models, relationship commitment and trust were identified as central mediating constructs. Of the three proposed antecedents of relationship commitment and trust in social marketing, as with Morgan and Hunts (1994) original model, shared values was identified as a key construct. Two of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) antecedents were modified from a social marketing perspective. Material benefits was modified to become mutual benefits. This change was reflective of the monetary and non-monetary nature of social marketing exchanges. Communication was also modified from a one way perspective in the original model to a two way perspective.
Figure 5.4 Constructs That Were Accepted, Rejected or Modified From Morgan and Hunt’s (KMV) Model of Relationship Marketing for the Proposed Social Marketing Model

Morgan and Hunt 1994 KMV Model of Relationship Marketing

Proposed Social Marketing Partnership

= Accepted
= Rejected
= Accepted but modified

= Expected Continuance
= Cooperation
= Tension
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Of the three outcomes relevant in the social marketing setting cooperation was accepted as a key construct. Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) construct functional conflict was modified to become tension and propensity to leave was modified within the social marketing context and thereby replaced by expectations of continuance.

Four of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) constructs were not supported within the social marketing literature or within the GYLG case study because of their transactional definitions and were hence rejected (relationship termination costs, opportunistic behavior, acquiescence and uncertainty). These constructs will not be discussed any further. Now that the constructs under investigation have been clarified the item scales selection process will be discussed in the following section.

5.5.2 Item Scale Selection Process

The selected item scales captured the domain of each construct (Churchill 1979) and were assessed as self reported measures of the respondents perceptions, meaning the respondent rated themselves or others based on their own opinion. Where appropriate previously formulated and validated measures within the marketing literature were adopted (Churchill 1979), this approach increased the item validity of the measures ensuring that the chosen item scales measured what they were supposed to (Ping 2004). A three-step approach was taken to item scale selection as summarised in Figure 5.5.

In step one the definitions and scales adopted within Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original research were analysed from a social marketing partnership perspective. Based on the operationlised construct definitions outlined in phase two of this research Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) items scales were either:

1. Adopted and if necessary the terminology modified to reflect the context of this research

   Or

2. Rejected on the basis they do not reflect social marketing principles and practices as represented in the construct definitions devised from phase one and phase two of this research.
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Upon rejection of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) items, in step two the item scales selected by MacMillan, Money et al. (2005) in their research were evaluated. MacMillan, Money et al.’s (2005) empirical investigation also extended Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) model by examining organisational relationships between a non-profit organisation (NPO) and their fundraisers focusing on the antecedents of commitment and trust. A copy of MacMillan, Money et al.’s (2005) model is available in Appendix D. As the characteristics of the NPO are similar to social marketing’s it was accepted that some of their chosen scales that had previously been adapted and validated in the non profit sector would be relevant to this research.

Figure 5.5 Summary of Item Scale Selection Processes

In step three, if both Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) and MacMillan, Money et al.’s (2005) scales were rejected the search was broadened to other marketing sources. To guide the selection of appropriate item scales, the researcher adopted Bearden, Netemeyer et al. (2011) scale selection criteria, which they had previously used to
assess the validity and reliability of scales frequently utilised in the marketing literature. This criteria specifies that measurement scales:

1. Had reasonable theoretical base/ conceptual definition, meaning that the domain of the scale was specified.
2. Was composed of multiple items or questions.
3. Developed within the marketing literature or was deemed relevant.
4. At least some scaling procedures were employed in scale development and

To assist in the analysis of the survey, the researcher imposed one additional criterion. All chosen scales must be continuous as AMOS, the software package used to analyse results cannot recognise categorical data (Byrne 2001).

5.6 Item Scales Selection

This section describes the eight item scales selected to measure the key social marketing constructs before pilot testing was undertaken. Validity and reliability measures have been reported for all measures; however, variation in the reporting of these statistics is evident as items were selected from various sources. A further outcome of adopting various sources relates to inconsistencies in the number of points on the Likert scales adopted (seven and five). For the purpose of this research all items will be measured using a five point Likert scale. Five point and seven point rating scales have been shown to produce similar mean scores (Dawes 2008).

Within this discussion the items or measures are also identified as being either formative or reflective in type which will have implications on the model estimation (Fornell and Bookstein 1982; Hair, Black et al. 2006). An introduction to formative and reflective measures is found below.
5.6.1 Reflective and Formative Measures

Reflective indicators are used in classic test theory and suggest that the measures are caused by one underlying construct. The reverse is true for formative measures whereby the measures are thought to impact or affect the construct (Fornell and Larcker 1981; Jarvis, MacKenzie et al. 2003). As Figure 5.6 illustrates, reflective measures explain the correlations of the variables which they are connected to (Cohen, Cohen et al. 1990); formative measures minimise residuals (Fornell and Bookstein 1982). By choosing incorrectly reflective or formative, causality could result in the misspecification of the model and therefore inconclusive evidence pertaining to relations (Jarvis, MacKenzie et al. 2003).

Figure 5.6 An Example of a Reflective and Formative Indicator

![Reflective Indicator](image1) ![Formative Indicator](image2)

Source: (Fornell and Bookstein 1982 p.441)

Formative measures complicate the SEM process as they are thought to cause changes in the latent variable as opposed to reflective indicators which are affected by changes in the latent variable (Cohen, Cohen et al. 1990; Chin 1998; Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer 2001).

Initially item scales will be discussed individually with the full questionnaire including classification questions prior to pretesting available in Appendix E. Where measures have been reverse coded, they will be identified using an asterisk (*).
5.6.2 Relationship Commitment

In their research Morgan and Hunt (1994) adopted and modified their relationship commitment item scale from Meyer and Allen’s (1984) affective commitment scale and the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979). Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) new scale comprised of eight items which were accepted as being relevant and transferable to the social marketing context based on the operationalised definition (see phase two). One item was omitted in the final scale as it was not supported within the social marketing literature or case study (“is very much like being a family”) leaving seven item measures in total. The vocabulary of two out of the seven items was modified prior to the pre-test stage whereby references to the ‘firm’ were replaced with ‘organisation’. Organisation is a term more widely referred to in the social marketing literature. The content of this chosen reflective item scale is identified in Figure 5.7.

Figure 5.7 Relationship Commitment Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct:</th>
<th>Relationship Commitment (Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from:</td>
<td>Morgan and Hunt (1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Scale Selected**

The relationship that my organisation has with _______

1) is something we are very committed to.
2) is very important to our organisation.
4) is something my organisation intends to maintain into the future (eg. Over the next 2 years possibly beyond).
5) is something my organisation could "walk away from tomorrow". (*)
6) is something my organisation really cares about.
7) deserves our organisations maximum effort to maintain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported validity and reliability measures</th>
<th>Reliability= 0.895 α = .895 VEE = .626 = .736</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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5.6.3 Trust

Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) definition of trust was rejected on the basis of its commercial orientation and therefore their scales were also deemed unsuitable for this research. Alternatively, based on interviews, focus groups and methods advocated by Churchill (1979), Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) developed their own scales to reflect trust within funder relationships. Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) conceptualised trust as encompassing reliability, predictability, and dependability. These attributes were accepted within the operationalised definition of trust within the social marketing domain. The researcher therefore accepted all six items within this reflective item scale. As the sampling frame for this research stretched beyond NPO’s, references to this specific type of organisation were modified and replaced by ‘partner’ within the items prior to the pre-test. The trust item scale is presented in Figure 5.8.

Figure 5.8 Trust Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct:</th>
<th>Trust (Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from:</td>
<td>Macmillan, Money et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scale Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Our partner is very unpredictable. I never know how they are going to act from one day to the next. (*)
2) I can never be sure what our partner is going to surprise us with next. (*)
3) I am confident that our partner will be thoroughly dependable, especially when it comes to things that are important to my organisation.
4) In my opinion, the partner will be reliable in the future.
5) Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know that our partner will always be willing to offer my organisation the support it may need (e.g., even if we had not funded them recently).
6) Our partner would not let us down, even if they found themselves in an unforeseen situation (e.g., competition from other funders, changes in government policy). (*)

Reported validity and reliability measures

| Cronbach alpha all measures above 0.7 |
| Fornell and Larcker reliability = 0.87 |
| AVE = 0.53 |
5.6.4 Mutual Benefit

As previously noted (see section 5.5.1) Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) economic dependence construct which measured the switching costs of partners within the exchange was not supported in phase one or phase two of this research. Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) also rejected the economic dependence construct in their research replacing it with nonmaterial benefits. On reflection, within the social marketing context nonmaterial benefits was also deemed unsuitable and too restrictive. Nonmaterial benefits did not account for the tangible and intangible exchanges that manifest through social marketing partnerships therefore the construct material benefits was accepted however modified. Mutual benefit was chosen as a more appropriate construct within the social marketing partnership model.

From the operationalised definition of mutual benefit described in phase two, complementary resources were identified as an appropriate means of measuring this construct as it captured both tangible and intangible benefits. Complementary resources is defined as a organisations ability to eliminate deficiencies in their capabilities by the sharing of resources to achieve their organisational goals (Lambe, Spekman et al. 2002). Upon review the three items measuring this reflective construct were all accepted, no modifications were made to the scale as shown in Figure 5.9.

Figure 5.9 Mutual Benefit Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Mutual Benefit (Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from: Lambe, Speckman et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Scale Selected

Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)

1) We both contribute different resources to the relationship that help us achieve our mutual goals.
2) We have complementary strengths that are useful to our relationship.
3) We each have separate abilities that when combined together, enable us to achieve goals beyond our individual reach.

Reported validity and reliability measures $\alpha = 0.74$
5.6.5 Shared Value

After considering the shared value item scale adopted by Morgan and Hunt (1994) the suitability of three of the items were rejected due to their transactional orientation; for example, they measured the quality of product offerings which is irrelevant in the social marketing context. One item could have been adopted however; after further consideration the language used needed significant modifications which could have altered its meaning therefore it was ultimately rejected. In the search for an appropriate item scale the researcher reviewed Macmillan and Money et al.’s (2005) item scales for shared values, which were modified from Swasy (1979). Macmillan and Money et al.’s scale were deemed advantageous as they were context free (Swasy 1979; MacMillan, Money et al. 2005) unlike Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) which measured specific attributes. The researcher accepted MacMillan, Monet et al. (2005) scale of shared value. The chosen reflective measure is shown in Figure 5.10.

Figure 5.10 Shared Value Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct:</th>
<th>Shared Value (Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from:</td>
<td>Macmillan’s and Money et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scale Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) In general, their opinions and values are a lot like ours.  
2) We like and respect their values.  
3) We share a very similar set of values (e.g., in terms of their beliefs about the problems manifesting in society ....).  

Reported validity and reliability measures  
Fornell and Larcker reliability = 0.84  
AVE =0.64  

5.6.6 Communication

Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) communication item scale was rejected as although it measured more than one facet of communication, Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) argued that Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) items did not appraise communication as a
two-way process. Within the context of this research, communication as defined in phase two of this research encompassed both communication across and between levels of the partnership, therefore reaffirming it as a two way process.

Within their research, Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) extended their interpretation of communication to include ‘informing, listening and staff interactions’ reflecting the two–way approach to communication within funder relationships. However, based on the findings of the literature review (Chapter 2) and case study (Chapter 4), these facets of communication were not supported within the social marketing partnership context and therefore Macmillan, Money et al.’s (2005) communication item scale was also rejected.

Upon further investigation other validated examples of scales measuring multiple dimensions of communication included Mohr and Spekman (1994) which examined ‘quality, information sharing and participation’. Mohr, Fisher et al. (1996) operationalised four facets of collaborative communication namely frequency, bidirectionality, noncoercive and formality which have been linked to greater relationship commitment (Mohr, Fisher et al. 1996). After considering the operationalised definition of communication described within the case study (see Chapter 4); information sharing, participation and formality were identified as the facets that needed to be measured within this research.

Formality as a construct measured the extent to which communication was planned (Mohr, Fisher et al. 1996) and therefore included indications of how the expectations within the partnership were managed. Information sharing was utilised to assess communication across and between levels. Closely synergised partnerships are thought to share more frequent and relevant information (Mohr and Spekman 1994). The third facet that was measured was the level of participation within the partnership which indicates the extent to which the partner is involved in the decision making processes. The item scales selected are outlined in Figure 5.11.
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Figure 5.11 Communication Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct:</th>
<th>Communication (Formative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapted from:</strong></td>
<td>Mohr and Spekman (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Scale Selected</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Our advice and counsel is sought by this partner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) We participate in goal setting and forecasting with this partner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) We help the partner in its planning activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Suggestions by us are encouraged by this partner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported validity and reliability measures</td>
<td>Coefficient alpha: 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapted from:</strong></td>
<td>Mohr and Spekman (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information sharing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) We inform the partner in advance of changing needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) In this relationship, it is expected that any information which might help the other party will be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The parties are expected to keep each other informed about events or changes that may affect the other party.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) It is expected that the parties will only provide information according to pre-specified agreements. (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) We do not volunteer much information regarding our business to the Manufacturer. (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) This partner keeps us fully informed about issues that affect our business. (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported validity and reliability measures</td>
<td>Coefficient alpha: 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapted from</strong></td>
<td>Mohr, Fisher et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formality:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) In coordinating our activities with this partner, formal communication channels are followed (i.e., channels are regularized, structured modes versus casual, informal, word-of-mouth modes).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) The terms of our relationship have been written down in detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The partners expectations of us are communicated in detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) The terms of our relationship have been explicitly verbalised and discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported validity and reliability measures</td>
<td>Coefficient alpha: 0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.7 Continuity of Expectations

Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) construct opportunistic behaviour was not supported as a key construct in phase 2 or phase 3 of this research due to the non–monetary nature of social marketing relationships. Instead, these two phases of the research identified continuity of expectations was identified as an appropriate measure as an outcome of commitment. Macmillan, Money et al.’s (2005) research was confined to the antecedents of funder relationships therefore they did not investigate the outcomes of such relationships which resulted in step two of the item selection process being skipped.

Continuity of expectations encompassed motivation to continue the relationship for the sustainability of long-term partnerships; however, motivation remains an area that is difficult to measure. Aulakh, Kobabe et al. (1996) developed an item scale to measure continuity of expectations. All four items were accepted and like other scales minor modifications were made to the terminology used within the scale, for examples references to the firm were changed to the organisation. Figure 5.12 identifies the item scales that were selected.

Figure 5.12 Continuity of Expectations Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Continuity of Expectations (Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from: (Aulakh, Kotabe et al. 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Scale Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Our organisation and our partner are very committed to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) If our organisation could find another partner in this country, we are likely to switch to a new partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) There is a high level of uncertainty in this partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) We and our partner firm are not sure how long our relationship will last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported validity and reliability measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a = 0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.8 Cooperation

Morgan and Hunt (1994) suggest that cooperation is a positive outcome of both commitment and trust. When developing this formative scale, as with conflict, Morgan and Hunt (1994) utilised Lusches (1979) approach to measure this construct. The researcher therefore adopted the same approach replacing Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) items with nine evident in the social marketing literature and case study findings. This item scale is shown in 5.13.

Figure 5.13 Cooperation Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Cooperation (Formative)</th>
<th>Adapted from: Morgan and Hunt (1994)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Scale Selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you characterize the cooperation between you and your partner regarding the following activities? (Not at all cooperative/ Very cooperative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Goal setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Sharing of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Shared learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Training and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Altering activities for a common purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Consistent messaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Integration of operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported validity and reliability measures</td>
<td>α = 0.89 as well as adequate content, convergent and criterion validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.9 Tension

The construct of conflict measured by Morgan and Hunt (1994) was represented as a negative outcome of trust. Conflict did not arise as a key characteristic in the literature review or case study; however, tension did manifest leading to the modification of this construct. To measure conflict in their model, Morgan and Hunt (1994) adopted a technique developed by Lusch (1976) whereby conflict was measured by defining several areas of business and categorizing how frequent the arguments relating to the subjects were. Arising from the literature and case study
within this research, seven core areas were identified to cause tension and were subsequently included in the measure.

A second facet to this formative construct is how the arising tension is managed referred to as conflict handling (Selnes 1998). Conflict handling was needed when perceptions of goals differ; this activity is supported within the social marketing literature in the form of tension handling. Selne (2002) argues that the relationship cannot be satisfied or sustained if conflict is not managed. As sustainability of long term relationships is an important aspect of social marketing partnerships conflict handling has also been measured. Both item scales are presented in Figure 5.14.

Figure 5.14 Tension Item Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Tension (Formative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from: Morgan and Hunt (1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scale Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the frequency to which you and your partner disagree regarding each of the following issues: (Very frequent/ very infrequent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Loss of ownership
2) Allocation of funding
4) Branding
5) Strategic direction
6) Goals of the partnership
7) Resource allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported validity and reliability measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α = 0.89 as well as adequate content, convergent and criterion validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict handling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please suggest your level of agreement – disagreement with the following statements... (5 point scale Agree – Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) The partner’s representative is good at solving disputes before they create problems in our working relationship.
9) The partner’s representative makes sure that problems do not arise in our working relationship.
10) The representatives of the partner’s have the ability to openly discuss solutions when problems arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported validity and reliability measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The coefficient alphas for the three multi-item scales are all high, indicating reliable measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.10 Item Scale Selection Summary

Table 5.2 provides an overview of all the constructs, the source for the corresponding item scale and the implemented pre-coding strategy.

Table 5.2 Sources of Item Scales and Assigned Pre-Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Morgan and Hunt (1994)</th>
<th>Macmillan, Money et al.</th>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>Pre–codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC 1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR 1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MB 1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SV 1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm 1–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy of Continuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mov 1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coop 1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ten 1–10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the scales were selected, each item statement was further reviewed to ensure that they were as precise as possible reflecting the boundaries of this research. Any double barreled statements were removed, and both positive and negative sentences were included (Churchill 1979). Furthermore, single item constructs can be deemed unreliable (Peter 1981) therefore each scale was comprised of multiple items each to enhance construct validity (Baumgartner and Homburg 1996; Hair, Black et al. 2006). Where large numbers of items were present, exploratory factor analysis was utilised to assess the dimensionality of the construct. If proved to be unidimensional the measures were aggregated to form composites which were analysed as a single indicator (Baumgartner and Homburg 1996).
5.7 Questionnaire Design

By utilising an online software package such as Survey Monkey, the researcher benefited from having immediate access to results. This ensured that response rates could be monitored throughout thereby assisting in the decision making processes related to distributing reminders to participants. When using this software for this purpose, the researcher did not have to open the questionnaire to monitor the response rate, as the number of responses was identifiable on the cover page. This ensured the anonymity of the survey participants were not effected in any way.

There remains little consensus on the optimum response rate in academic questionnaires (Baruch 1999) or rigorous empirical evidence to support suggested rates (Deutskens, Ruyter et al. 2004). However, regardless of limited guidance in this area, action was taken to minimize non-response bias to ensure the maximum response possible was achieved. Survey Monkey ensured that the survey looked professional and that the questionnaire was spacious and easy to read. For example, each topic was presented on its own page and instructions were clearly visible on both the introductory email as well as the beginning of the survey. The survey also included a number of screening questions at the start, therefore based on the response to a particular question the respondent could be automatically skipped to the end of the survey. This was beneficial as it reduced the dependence on the participant to follow the instructions, reduce time wasting from unnecessarily completing the questionnaire and it assisted the researcher in managing the data.

5.7.1 Legitimacy

To increase the legitimacy of the research, emails distributed within the island of Ireland (IOI) were disseminated using a National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG) email address; the survey itself was branded with the NUIG logo and adopted the Universities brand colour scheme. Those surveyed in the remainder of the United Kingdom (UK) were administered and endorsed by the National Social Marketing Centre (NSMC).
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The researcher also included a progress bar at the top of each page as an indicator of the length of the survey. Respondents were given the option to move back and forth between the pages during the survey however; once they had exited the survey responses could not be changed. Figure 5.15 provides an example of the layout of one question within the online questionnaire.

Figure 5.15 Screen Shot of Online Survey

When distributing the email careful consideration was also given to details such as to the subject line of the email. The subject line needed to motivate participants to open the survey hence increasing opening rates and also reduce the chances of the survey being categorized as spam which could result in failure to penetrate Firewalls. The chosen subject line for IOI respondents was “Need help creating sustainable behavioural change partnerships?” This subject line was modified by the NSMC who chose to use “PhD study on sustainable behavioural change partnerships”.

5.7.2 Screening Questions

Three screening questions were included at the beginning of the online survey to rigorously establish that the survey participants had the required level of knowledge to complete the online survey. Individuals who did not fulfill these requirements
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were automatically asked to exit the study at this stage. These requirements three requirements are:

1) Practitioner of social marketing

Andreasen’s (2002) benchmark criteria for the legitimacy of social marketing was included as the first screening question within the online survey as shown in Figure 5.16. This question was included to ensure that all the respondents who completed the survey were social marketers as this research was investigating social marketing partnerships. Survey participants were required to answer yes to at least five of the nine benchmark criteria statements in order to be included in the research.

Figure 5.16 Screening Questions for Utilising the Principles of Social Marketing

*1. Please tick the box beside the statements that are relevant to your organisations activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-change is the benchmark used to design and evaluate interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects consistently use audience research to understand target audiences at the outset of interventions (i.e., formative research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routinely pre-test intervention elements before they are implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor interventions as they are rolled out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is careful segmentation of target audiences to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness in the use of scarce resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central element of any influence strategy is creating attractive and motivational exchanges with target audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy attempts to use all four Ps of the traditional marketing mix; for example, it is not just advertising or communications. That is, it creates attractive benefit packages (products, products, while minimizing costs (price) whenever possible, making the exchange convenient and easy (place) and communicating powerful messages through media relevant to—and preferred by—target audiences (promotion).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful attention is paid to the competition faced by the desired behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Andreasen 2002)

2) Partnership engagement

Survey participants were required to have engaged in a social marketing partnership activity in the past three years (See Figure 4.16). This was a requirement as this research was investigating social marketing partnership development therefore in
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order to adequately test the chosen constructs the respondent needed to have a level of experience engaging in partnerships.

3) Level of knowledge

Adopting an approach previously implemented by Lambe, Spekman et al. (2002) when seeking to survey experts in the area of alliances, those who said yes to participating in partnership activities were subsequently asked to rate their level of knowledge of the partnership they were referring to. Those who indicated a low level of knowledge on the 5 point scale were also eliminated from the study (see Figure 5.17). These respondents were eliminated as they were deemed to have inadequate knowledge to complete the survey.

Figure 5.17 Partnership Engagement and Knowledge Question

2. Have you participated in a social marketing/behavioural change partnership in the last 3 years (2008 – present)?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Please rate your level of knowledge relating to the partnership you are thinking about
   - Very Knowledgeable
   - Knowledgeable
   - Neither knowledgeable or unknowledgeable
   - Not knowledgeable
   - Not very knowledgeable

5.7.3 Incentives

In their review of the advantages and disadvantages of online surveys Ilieva, Baron et al. (2002) reported corroborating evidence that topic salience is positively correlated to response rates; meaning that those who are interested in a topic are more likely to respond (Groves, Presser et al. 2004). To maximize topic salience the sample definition for participation for this research was very specific ensuring that distribution was restricted to those who were considered knowledgeable in the area of social marketing partnerships. The relevance of the research topic was communicated to the participants through an introductory email and consecutive
follow up email communication. This brief email emphasised the importance of the research, the value of participating for the respondents and its potential impact on their working lives. An incentive for the survey respondents included an agreement to share the key findings from the research. As an added incentive survey respondents were also offered access to a practical framework for developing partnerships which also resulted from the analysis of results.

Debate continues regarding the use of incentives particularly monetary in nature within survey research relating to the possible negative impact they can have on the quality of responses (Ilieva, Baron et al. 2002; Groves, Presser et al. 2004). As suggested above the incentive offered within the context of this research was non–monetary in nature; instead the participants were considered niche experts in their fields and could heavily benefit through participation.

5.7.4 Pre-coding

As Survey Monkey was integrated with SPSS this package also assisted in eliminating errors resulting from manually entering the data; however care was taken to ensure that the pre-codes utilised by the software corresponded with the researcher’s. A copy of the coding strategy was previously provided in Table 5.2.

5.8 Sampling

5.8.1 Sample Population Definition

A two tiered approach to sampling was employed during this research to ensure an adequate amount of data was collected to fulfill the requirements of SEM analysis. If the response rate from Tier one did not suffice the requirements of SEM, Tier two was activated by the researcher as a contingency.

Tier One of the sampling definition sought to recruit representatives of organisations in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) and the United Kingdom (UK) who have within the last five years:
1. Participated in the planning, development, implementation and/or strategising of social marketing programmes, interventions and/or campaigns and
2. Adopted a partnership approach to facilitate social marketing activities

From this sample definition a number of observations can be made. Firstly, it is apparent that participation in the survey was not confined to those whose job title contained the phrase ‘social marketing’. The decision to omit this restriction centered on an awareness and acceptance by the researcher that the adoption of the term social marketing is still growing particularly in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) context. Indications of growth include the hosting of the World Social Marketing Conference 2011 in Dublin, and since 2009 the National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG) has organised and secured funding for an annual National Social Marketing Conference. The researcher therefore acknowledges that practitioners may not recognise themselves technically as social marketers instead adopting ‘behavioural change’ as a commonly utilised phrase to describe their area of expertise.

Furthermore, the decision to target ‘representatives of organisations’ as opposed to restricting recruitment to senior management was also undertaken to ensure that social marketing partnerships were examined from a multi level, multi organisational perspective. This ensured that both strategic decision makers who guided or advised on social marketing programmes as well as those who actively managed or implemented them were included within the sample.

The boundaries of this research had already stretched beyond the ROI to include Northern Ireland (NI) as the Get Your Life in Gear initiative was an all–island campaign therefore included participants from across the IOI, with NI being part of the UK.

The UK provides valuable research and development opportunities for social marketing particularly through the establishment of the National Social Marketing Centre (NSMC) in 2006. This centre of excellence shares best practice approaches with social marketers specialising in areas such as research, training and
development. The NSMC coordinate annual conferences and were responsible for initiating the first World Social Marketing Conference in 2009. The UK government has shown further support for social marketing through the publishing of White Papers such as ‘Health Lives, Healthy People’ which recommended the implementation of social marketing in the public health arena (Department of Health 2011).

The UK and the ROI are continually faced with addressing similar complex issues such as obesity, smoking cessation and the environment and therefore utilise similar approaches to developing solutions. There have also been calls for an ‘all island’ approach to complex issues such as obesity and alcohol consumption meaning that in the future more campaigns will involve partnerships between organisations/agencies within and between NI and ROI.

The sampling definition for Tier one all includes practitioners and academics working in the field of social marketing at a up, mid and/or down stream level and those who classify themselves as public, private, non government organization or government agency.

When Tier two was activated it expanded the geographical restrictions of Tier one from the ROI and UK to a global population. All other aspects of the population definition remained the same.

5.8.2 Sampling Frame

There was no available direct sampling frame of social marketing partnership experts on the IOI, therefore an indirect sampling frame was required to be generated from various sources that were available to the researcher.

The four primary sources included:

1. Partners external to safefood who participated in the Get Your Life into Gear programme
By participating in the GYLG project the external partners developed a deepened understanding of the issues that impacted on social marketing partnerships. During their participation in this project the external partners were aware that the researcher was analysing the interactions within initiative as part of PhD research. However, the external partners had not actively commented on partnership development through a survey, structured interview or otherwise. Two partners were excluded from the sampling frame as one was the researcher’s doctoral supervisor; the other had limited expertise in the area of behavioural change and did not actively engage in the intervention.


For the past three years NUIG has hosted an Annual National Social Marketing Conference (2009 – 2011). The conference, the only one of its kind in Ireland, evolved as an opportunity for delegates to learn best practice approaches to social marketing at a national and international level. The names of the delegates that attended these conferences were already in the public domain as each year the delegate lists were published in the conference pack. The conference delegate lists were also deemed suitable for this research as for the past two years conference registration was managed on-line and therefore a valid email address was required from all participants.

Permission was sought from the conference committee to contact conference delegates to participate in the online survey. Once permission was granted, these lists containing a total of 181 delegates were cleaned to ensure that duplicates and those known to be unsuitable by the researcher and conference organisers were removed from the list. For instance, as a college event the conference was supported by academics from multiple disciplines who sought to gain a deeper understanding of the discipline however would not necessarily practice social marketing. Also, past college students from NUIG (undergraduate and postgraduates) were removed as they were not practicing social marketing. These delegates were eliminated after consultation with the conference organiser and any delegates that the researcher was
unsure of remained on the list. The researcher also checked that a useable email address had been provided before the online questionnaire was distributed.

In total, 126 delegates who had registered to attend these social marketing conferences between 2009 and 2011 were deemed eligible to participate in this study. There was a predicted response rate of 25% which suggested a potential sample of 32.

3. Delegates of the World Social Marketing Conference (WSMC) 2011

Sixty Irish delegates attended the Second World Social Marketing Conference 2011 in Dublin, Ireland. These delegates were cross checked against attendees of the Annual National Social Marketing conferences and duplicates removed. This amounted to five additional potential survey participants.

4. National Social Marketing Centre (NSMC) UK

The NSMC were contacted to assist in the development of an indirect sampling frame for the UK through their e-newsletter database. Data protection protocols restricted the researcher’s ability to access the e-newsletter database and therefore the NSMC agreed to manage the distribution of the online survey in the UK.

The NSMC database comprised of any individual who voluntarily signed up to receive the NSMC bi-monthly e-newsletter. Their current mailing list included approximately 3200 subscribers; however, the NSMC advised that some participants may be deemed unsuitable for the purpose of this research. For example, advertising agency consultants or research agencies may not have fulfilled the requirements of the sampling definition however would receive notification of the survey. The NSMC indicated the open rates for their e–bulletin was approximately 42%, leaving a potential sample of 1344. However, as the survey was distributed within an e-newsletter a further click through rate applies. Generally, within the marketing industry the click through rate for surveys contained in an e-newsletter averages 5% (Mailchimp 2012) leaving a sample size of 67.
On reflection, it was unlikely that the potential sample size from the ROI and NSMC lists would fulfil the requirements for this research; therefore Tier 2 of the sampling strategy included a global mailing list.

5. Social Marketing Global List-Serve

The Social Marketing Global List-Serve was part of tier two, the reserve sample frame, which was activated based on assessment of response rates. This List-Serve is a global forum used to discuss issues arising in the social marketing field. Subscribers can post questions and comments via email to all other subscribers. Upon activating tier two the researcher was aware of the possible cross-posting from the IOI and UK sampling frames, however, there was no mechanism to rectify this contamination as the list was managed in Georgetown in the United States.

As the subscribers to this list-serve are in a continual state of fluctuation, it is difficult to determine the exact number of subscribers at any one time. However, the most recent data indicated that the list had 2100 subscribers in 2009 (Cheng, Kotler et al. 2010). Applying an estimated open rate of 25% for online surveys leaves a potential sample size of 525. Applying an approximate click through rate of 5% (Mailchimp 2012) leaves 27.

Over the past two years two new social marketing associations have launched; the International Social Marketing Association (iSMA) and the European Social Marketing Association. Both associations were in their infancy meaning their membership lists were in formation but not established and therefore were deemed unsuitable for an indirect sampling frame at this time.

The researcher acknowledges that this sampling frame strategy limits the generalisablity of results as the total population remains unknown.

5.8.3 Sampling Method

Based on this sample definition and frame previously described a non-probability sampling strategy was appropriate for this research. The researcher had control over
the IOI sample frame, however; due to data protection reasons did not have access to the sampling frame used in the UK. As the survey was being distributed via the NSMC e-newsletter, the NSMC would not permit the implementation of a simple, systematic or stratified random sampling strategy. Therefore the requirements of a probability sampling method could not be fulfilled.

As Tier two was reliant on the Global Social Marketing List serve, the same issue materialised, whereby the researcher’s lack of control over the list inhibited the adoption of a probability sampling strategy. Furthermore, by adopting an online strategy the researcher accepted that it was difficult to generate a sampling frame where everyone in the population has a known chance of selection (Dillman 2000). For these reasons the requirements of probability sampling were not satisfied and non-probability sampling was utilised.

5.8.4 Sample Size

Much debate surrounds the optimum theoretical sample size for conducting SEM (Hair, Black et al. 2006); the actual sample size for this research needed to fulfil the requirements for SEM data analysis (Chenet, Tynan et al. 2000). As SEM is based on asymptotic theory the sample size must be large enough to generate trustworthy parameter estimates and test statistics (Baumgartner and Homburg 1996). Suggestions include samples greater or equal to 200 (Hoe 2008). In practice this response rate is not normally achievable and it has been argued that such restrictions limit empirical research (Hau 2004).

In the case of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original research, they too adopted a two tiered approach to data collection, they expected that utilising local chapters in the automobile industry, that a higher sample size would be achieved. The first wave resulted in 49 returned postal questionnaires. A second wave encompassing a broader target audience resulted in the collection of a further 129 responses. Within their research Macmillan, Money et al. (2005) tested their model with a much smaller sample containing 41 respondents. Therefore from a practical perspective this research aimed for a sample size between 50 and 125 as illustrated in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3 Summary of Sampling Frame and Potential Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of sample</th>
<th>Potential sample size (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners external to safefood who participated in the Get Your Life into Gear programme</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates from the Annual Social Marketing Conference (Ireland 2009 – 2011).</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Social Marketing Centre (NSMC) UK</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marketing Georgetown Global ListServ</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Total</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, it was not the purpose of this research to generalise the findings to the all social marketing practitioners (within developed and developing countries. Instead, this research seeks to initially test the theoretical model in a particular context. Therefore the greatest consideration is that the current sample size is appropriate to test this model within the given context.

5.9 Fieldwork

Before the online survey was distributed the questionnaire was pretested and amendments were made. This section describes the pretesting procedures.

5.9.1 Pretest procedures

Adopting a similar strategy to Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original research, from the sampling frame a list of eight social marketing experts were chosen to pretest the survey. These experts were a mixture of academics (n=3) and practitioners (n =5) working within the field of social marketing in the ROI and the UK. The pretest candidates were skewed slightly towards social marketing practitioners as this grouping was considered to have more experience developing and implementing social marketing partnerships. The social marketing academics were perceived to have a deepened knowledge of its conceptualization. All the practitioners within the
pretest held management level positions within their organisations and had worked on major social marketing campaigns in the IOI or UK. The academics also held senior positions. Two statisticians also pretested the questionnaire to assess the scales from a methodological and analysis perspective.

Each pretest candidate was invited to partake in the pretest via an email sent by the researcher. Once agreement was secured the researcher made an appointment to meet each pretest candidate face to face or via teleconference for those living outside the IOI.

The pretest candidates were sent the survey introduction email containing the link to the online questionnaire prior to the pretest and were asked not to open the link. The pretest was utilised as a mechanism to test the content and face validity of the online questionnaire. It made the researcher aware of any difficulties experienced whilst completing the online questionnaire in terms of comprehension, language, structure and overall content. By allowing perceived experts in the field to pre-test the questionnaire, as described by Dillman (2000), the researcher could ensure that all necessary questions were included and unnecessary questions were eliminated. On two occasions, whereby the survey was blocked by a Firewall and the internet connection was lost, the pretest was implemented in hard copy format. This did not impact on the participant’s comprehension of the questions, although the aesthetic experience was interrupted. It also provided the researcher with an opportunity to discuss the use of firewalls and reconsider the chosen subject line of the email.

5.8.2 Pretest Implementation

During the pretest, the researcher adopted Dillman’s (2000) Cognitive Interviewing Technique as the method used to assess the comprehensiveness of the questionnaire. Adopting this technique, the pretest candidates were asked to complete the online questionnaire in the presence of the researcher whilst reading the questions aloud and verbalising their thoughts on each question as they arise. This technique allowed the researcher to probe the pretest candidates to ensure the strengths and/or weakness of the questionnaire design and content were articulated. Probes that were utilised included, “what are you thinking? Can you tell me more about that? Remember to
read aloud. Is there anything you would add or remove from that list?” (Dillman 2000 p.141).

An alternative pretest strategy was employed for the pretest candidates residing in England and Scotland where face to face interviews were not feasible. In this instance Dillman’s (2000) retrospective technique was implemented. Adopting this technique, the pretest candidates completed the online questionnaire as they would if they had received any online survey request in their email. This alternative reduced the distraction of the researcher asking questions whilst completing the online questionnaire and allowed the pretest candidate to assess the entire survey experience. The pretest candidates were also specifically requested to record the length of time it took to complete the questionnaire. Feedback on the questionnaire was received via a scheduled follow up telephone/Skype call.

By the completion of the pretest phase, the researcher was able to answer these crucial questions also posed by Dillman (2002 p.141):-

- Are all the words understood?
- Are all the questions interpreted similarly by all respondents?
- Do all the questions have an answer that can be marked by every respondent?
- Is the respondent likely to read and answer each question?
- Does the email create a positive impression?

5.9.3 Amendments to the Online Questionnaire

Arising from the pretest a number of amendments were made to the online questionnaire in relation to structure and content. A complete copy of the online questionnaire before the pretest is contained in Appendix E; the final copy including the amendments is available in Appendix F.
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5.9.3.1 Cover Emails

The cover email was deemed to contain all the information required by the participant; however it was suggested that it was too formal and therefore may alienate some practitioners. As a result amendments were made and a less formal approach was reflected in the cover letter. A copy of the cover emails sent throughout the process is contained in Appendix G.

To accurately portray the completion time for the online questionnaire multiple participants suggested that the approximate timing included in cover email and accompanying instructions should be reduced from 18-20 minutes to 15–18 minutes. This was deemed a more accurate reflection of the actual completion time.

The interchangeable use of the terms social marketing and behavioural change throughout the online questionnaire was deemed confusing for the pretest candidates. The pretest candidates on both IOI and UK recommended that behavioural change was adopted to ensure that all respondents felt the online questionnaire was relevant to them. Question one, the social marketing benchmark screening question would ensure that the survey respondent fulfilled the social marketing criteria and behavioural change is a common term used by practicing social marketers.

5.9.3.2 Screening Questions

The structure of the first question (Social Marketing benchmark criteria) caused confusion amongst the pretest candidates who were of the opinion that the dichotomous options (yes or no) should be changed to a Likert scale from Always to Never. This amendment ensured that the survey respondent could answer this question as accurately as possible. It was also suggested that statement 7 of the benchmark criteria was reworded as it caused confusion due to its length and the amount of information it contained. An additional criterion was added to the benchmarks to capture the overall motivations of the organisation in relation to the principles of social marketing (Statement nine: My organization is concerned with the betterment of the client and society).
It also emerged from the pretest that the instructions relating to how to accurately complete the partnership related questions within the survey were positioned too late in the questionnaire. During the pretest these instructions were located before the item scales measuring the key social marketing partnership constructs (located on screen three). The pretest candidates were of the opinion that to maintain the accuracy of responses these instructions should come earlier so that the respondent understood specifically how to answer the survey (on screen two). Further clarity could also be achieved with in these instructions by including a statement defining what the researcher meant by ‘behavioural change partnerships’.

In relation to the screening questions, it was recommended that issues such as the knowledgeable ability, involvement and maturity of the survey respondent to the partnership needed deeper probing. This could be achieved by the addition of two questions. This addition was accepted and included in the revised online questionnaire.

5.9.3.3 Key Social Marketing Partnership Constructs

Specifically commenting on the item scales relating to the key social marketing partnership constructs, the pretest candidates recommended a consistent layout so there was a standardized format throughout the entire online questionnaire.

For the remainder of the online questionnaire with the exception of the questions relating to tension and cooperation, only minor text changes were suggested and consequently rectified. It was suggested that three items within the survey should be deleted as they were deemed repetitious; however, these changes were rejected as the researcher believed they would impact on the meaning of the scales.

Tension and cooperation were probed twice during the interviews as they were formative measures and therefore needed to be inclusive and for the reasons outlined in section 5.3.1. The pretest candidates were asked if there was anything they would add or remove from the lists with the expectation that there would be additional constructs. Six additions were made to the cooperation and seven to the tension
scales. The suggested additions to the formative questions are highlighted in Table 5.4.

Before the classification section of the online questionnaire it was also suggested that two open ended questions could be added. The first asked the survey respondent to specify their definition of partnerships and the second asked what they deemed as characteristics of bad partnerships.

Table 5.4 Additions to the cooperation and tension item scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Tension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims and objectives</td>
<td>Deciding on actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing outcomes and outputs</td>
<td>Allocating actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for strategy development</td>
<td>How goals and direction can be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic measures</td>
<td>Working in parallel as opposed to in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhering to processes</td>
<td>Reason for the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of understanding relating to the motives of the partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.9.3.4 Classification Section**

Two classification questions were removed as a result of the pretest (sex and age) as it was agreed that although they were standard classification questions they did not pertain to the analysis.

Finally, for ethical reasons the last question which asked respondents to opt in for the summary of results needed further clarity to ensure the survey respondent understood their anonymity was protected throughout. Therefore, a sentence was included stating that the contact information provided would not be used to identify the participants of the survey.
A number of changes were also rejected including questions relating to the qualifications of the participant, the name of the organisation they worked for and one item scale linked to trust.

### 5.9.4 Survey Administration

Once the pretest was complete and amendments were made to the online questionnaire, preparations began to administer the final survey. Figure 5.18 illustrates the distribution strategy for the survey. As planned and discussed earlier, this survey was distributed to the Tier one sample (ROI and UK) as a hyper-link enclosed in an email or e-newsletter. Arrangements were made between the researcher and NSMC to send the invitation emails simultaneously to all Tier one participants. However, despite repeated attempts by the researcher to ensure the surveys were distributed simultaneously due to internal operational issues within the NSMC there were unprecedented delays in the distribution of the survey that were beyond the control of the researcher.

After the initial three weeks of the survey being in the field the response rate was deemed lower than expected. This was largely attributed to the fact that the UK survey had not been distributed at this point. After considering the implications of this delay and the response rate from the IOI survey respondents Tier two of the sampling strategy was activated. Tier two initially encouraged UK and ROI social marketers to participate in the online survey; it secondly welcomed respondents from the global social marketing community who fulfilled the social marketing benchmark criteria.

After the survey was closed the results were subsequently prepared for data analysis.
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Figure 5.18 Summary of Survey Implementation Strategy

Online Survey
(www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships)

National social marketing conference Ireland delegate list

Notification emailed via NUIG (02/04/2012)

Online Questionnaire sent (04/04/2012)

Reminder/Thank you email (17/04/2012)

Final reminder (10/05/2012)

Survey Closed 15/05/2012
N = 90

Usable surveys n = 54

NSMC

NSMC monthly e-bulletin (02/05/2012)

Special edition e-bulletin (10/05/2012)

Global ListServ Mailing list

Posted for UK & IOI participants (01/05/2012)

Posted for global participants (11/05/2012)

Final Reminder/Thank you email (15/05/2012)
5.10 Structural Equation Modelling Data

5.9.1 Preparation

Before SEM analysis was undertaken a number of checks were performed to ensure that there were no errors that could impact on the data. These included:

- Checking that the coding has been completed correctly

Survey Monkey the software utilised for conducting the online questionnaire was integrated with SPSS therefore reducing the likelihood of error from manually transferring the data. The automated coding implemented from this SPSS integration was reviewed to ensure that the codes corresponded with the researcher’s pre-codes structure.

- Dealing with any missing data

Any questionnaires that contained missing data were marked with a 99 in SPSS to differentiate the missing responses from the others. Questionnaires that had more than 50% missing data were eliminated from further analysis. As a result of these checks, three respondents were found to contain missing data. Two had missed one variable in one question; a third had skipped the last question relating to cooperation. Due to the small sample size available it was not feasible to use a multiple imputation technique within SPSS, therefore missing variable analysis was used as an alternative.

5.10.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Prior to running the Structural Equation Model (SEM), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was utilised to test internal consistency and ensure the undimensionality and validity of the scales (Peter 1981; Clark and Watson 1995; Hair, Black et al. 2006). CFA was computed to assess the measurement theory of the model and therefore the construct validity of the items.
As this research examined the relationships between multiple constructs the necessity for unidimensionality is enhanced. This prerequisite ensures that the set of item measures has only one underlying construct and cross loadings are therefore hypothesized to be zero (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

**5.10.3 Model Specification**

As indicated in section 5.5.2 the constructs under investigation have been defined and item scales selected. To reiterate the constructs that will be represented within the measurement model are; Trust, Commitment, Mutual Benefit, Shared Values, Communication, Expectations of continuance, Tension and Cooperation.

SEM assumes that data is normally distributed, if violated incorrect interpretation of results may arise as goodness of fit statistics could become inflated while standard errors appear underestimated (Byrne 2001; Shook, Ketchen et al. 2004).

**5.9.3.1 Path Diagram**

A visual representation of the hypothesized measurement model is illustrated in the path diagram shown in Figure 5.19 (Diamantopoulos 1994). This diagram comprehensively represents the relationships under investigation (model paths), the specification of the parameters that are estimated and those that are fixed or constrained (Chin 1998). This simplified version of the research hypothesizes outlined in Table 5.19 is the equivalent of mathematical notation or equations used within SEM (Diamantopoulos 1994; Byrne 2010). By drawing a path diagram, error arising during the specification phase can be avoided by making omitted links more visible (Diamantopoulos 1994).

To further demonstrate, within Figure 5.19 the latent variables that cannot be observed directly are represented in eclipses (Cohen, Cohen et al. 1990). One–sided arrows are also visible in the path point which represent from cause to outcome, each straight arrow depicts a relationship or loading which is hypothesized to exist based on the measurement theory. The curved two–headed arrow symbolizes intercorrelations not thought to be causal in nature. This path also acknowledges that
error exists in the model. Error refers to how much the latent variable does not explain about the measured variable. The errors are represented as small circle enclosures (Byrne 2001; Hair, Black *et al.* 2006; Byrne 2010).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to test the measurement model as it specifies the correspondence between the indicators and the constructs. The latent variables are unobservable and therefore does not have a metric scale. AMOS automatically fixes the factor loadings to 1 (Byrne 2001; Hair, Black *et al.* 2006).

5.9.3.2 Model Identification

Before the model can be tested it needs to be identified which assesses whether there is enough information to identify the solution to the structural equation (Hair, Black *et al.* 2006). The model can be characterized by the degrees of freedom after the
estimated parameters have been specified, meaning the model can be deemed Underidentified, Justidentified and Overidentified (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

If a model is Underidentified there is not enough available information available to test the model; meaning there are more parameters in the model then item variances or covariance’s which results in a negative degree of freedom. A Justidentified model refers to one which the model is saturated, there is 0 degrees of freedom and hence the theory is not tested as their goodness of fit (GOF) is also equal to zero. The researcher is required to establish an Overidentified model meaning there are positive degrees of freedom usually resulting from a 4 item scale. If one construct that is Underidentified and another that is Overidentified are integrated into the overall model, the extra degrees of freedom may compensate for each other and the model may ultimately be deemed Overidentified.

Referring back to the measurement model outlined in Figure 5.19, certain steps have been taken to manage any identification issues before they arise. Where appropriate, at least three and preferably four items have been stipulated per construct (Cohen, Cohen et al. 1990). This will ensure that the net degrees of freedom will be positive and greater than zero, fulfilling the order condition.

5.10.4 Model Estimation

During this phase the overall fit of the hypothesized measurement model is tested by examining the results against the data collected. The validity of results will also be examined by using model fit indices. These are described below.

5.10.4.1 Model fit indices

A primary aim of SEM after the model has been specified is to assess the Goodness of Fit of this hypothesized model (Hu and Bentler 1999). Within the literature there are a plethora of indices that can be applied to assess the fit of the model to the theory (Hooper, Coughlan et al. 2010), both incremental and absolute. Incremental indices assess how well the specified model fits the null model. The absolute indices assess the overall fit of the structural and measurement models (Hair, Black et al.)
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2006). To date, there is little consensus of how to choose the most appropriate Goodness of Fit statistics as each are thought to be sensitive to different model characteristics such as sample size or estimation procedures (Byrne 2010; Hooper, Coughlan et al. 2010). To overcome this limitation a number of fit statistics have been chosen to overcome this issue and together will be used to evaluate the model. This section will introduce each statistic outlining the criteria used to draw conclusions relating to model fit.

5.10.4.2 Absolute Fit Indices

5.10.4.2.1 The Chi Square test

The Chi–square test or Likelihood Ratio Test statistic commonly notated as $\chi^2$ is one of the most widely utilised test statistics (Hu and Bentler 1999). It is one method of assessing if the null hypothesis i.e. the fit of the model is accepted or rejected (Bentler 1990) where the p value should be significant at 0.05 or greater (Bagozzi, Yi et al. 1991). Although a commonly cited measure, a number of limitations of this statistic relate to its sensitivity to large sample size and of particular concern is its tendency to reject true population models (Byrne 2010). This test also lacks statistical power with small sample sizes; a further assumption that the model fits perfectly in the population have lead researchers to adopt other goodness of fit statistics to further verify results and avoid misspecification (Bagozzi and Youjae 1988; Bentler 1990; Bagozzi, Yi et al. 1991; Hooper, Coughlan et al. 2010). For an in –depth synopsis of the weakness relating to $\chi^2$ refer to Bentler (1990). Alternatively, other Goodness of fit indices can be utilised to support the $\chi^2$ (Baumgartner and Homburg 1996). For example, the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) test tries to correct for the problem of $\chi^2$ alone and is described below (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

5.10.4.2.2 Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA)

Byrne (2010) suggests the RMSEA test provides the most information when assessing a structural model by telling the researcher “how well the model, with unknown but optimally chosen parameter estimates would fit the populations
covariance matrix” (Byrne 2010 p. 80). This test favours parsimony and therefore a model with fewer parameters (Hooper, Coughlan et al. 2010). When assessing the fit of the model values less than 0.05 are indicators of good fit, whereas values up to 0.08 are equated to reasonable fit with values above 0.1 suggesting poor fit (Hu and Bentler 1999; Byrne 2010). Hooper, Coughlan et al. (2010) suggest that these ranges have become more stringent in recent years and suggest revised cut off values of 0.06 with an upper limit of 0.07 (Hu and Bentler 1999). A further advantage of this test is it reports a 90% confidence interval (Byrne 2010). For example a narrow confidence interval would suggest precision for the RMSEA value and good model fit within the population (Byrne 2010).

5.10.4.2.3 Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)

The Goodness of Fit statistic is used to “calculate the proportion of variance that is accounted for by the estimated population covariance” (Hooper, Coughlan et al. 2010 p.54). The Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) differs slightly as it adjusts for the number of specified degrees of freedom. This is another test related to parsimony as it acts as a penalty for including extra parameters (Byrne 2010). Values range from 0–1 for both tests with those closer to 1 deemed an indicator of good fit (Byrne 2010).

5.10.4.3 Incremental fit indices

5.10.4.3.1 Comparative Fit Index (CFI)

The CFI is normed in the population and thus has values bounded by zero and 1; the CFI provides an unbiased estimate of its corresponding population value, and therefore it should be independent of sample size. The CFI can be thought of as a measure of how much variation in measures is accounted for from a practical standpoint. CFI is advantageous as it avoids the underestimation of fit (Bentler 1990).

A rough rule of thumb is that the CFI should be greater than or equal to 0.90, where values less than 0.90 suggest that significant amounts of variance remain to be
explained and values greater than or equal to 0.90 imply that further relaxation of parameter constraints are not warranted and might lead to over fitting (Bagozzi and Foxall 1996).

5.10.4.3.2 Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI)

The TLI is conceptually similar to the CFI test is and compares a theoretical model against the null. TLI values range from below zero to above one, however good fitting models have values close to one.

The Goodness of Fit statistics are summarised in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5 Summary of Goodness of Fit Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>P value $&gt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$&lt; 0.05$ good fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0.05 and 0.08 reasonable fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0.08 and 0.1 mediocre fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 0.1 Poor fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% confidence interval reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) &amp; Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>Values close to one indicative of model fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>Values close to 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker – Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>Close to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conjunction with these preliminary tests, parameter estimates and significance tests will be utilised to examine the internal structure of the model (Bagozzi, Yi et al. 1991).
5.10.5 Content Validity

Construct validity is a necessary condition for theory testing as it ensures that the construct corresponds with the measure, therefore increasing the predictability of it within scientific enquiry (Peter 1981). CFA can assess construct validity as it investigates the accuracy of the measurement. Two components of construct validity include convergent and discriminant validity (Hair, Black et al. 2006) which are explained in this section.

5.10.5.1 Convergent validity

The first component of construct validity is convergent validity which suggests that the indicators of a specific construct should converge or share a high proportion of variance (Hair, Black et al. 2006). Convergent validity considers the factor loadings and can be measured by an evaluation of Maximum Likelihood estimates. For example if the model is shown to exhibit high convergent validity high loadings on a factor would suggest they converge on the same point. Two criteria should also be adhered to; the factor loadings should be statistically significant and standardized loading estimates should be 0.5 or higher, and ideally 0.7 or higher (Fornell and Larcker 1981; Shook, Ketchen et al. 2004; Hair, Black et al. 2006). Variance-extracted measures should equal or exceed 50% while 70% is considered the upper limit for the reliability of a construct (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

Coefficient alpha is the most common measure of reliability, however should not be assessed in isolation (Bollen 1990). The reliability of the measure using coefficient alpha will be assessed after the unidimensionality of the construct as it is a requirement for an accurate outcome (Ping 2004). Coefficient alpha will also be used to assess convergence, the measure of reliability for this estimate is 0.7 or higher (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

5.10.5.2 Discriminant Validity

Fornell and Lacker (1981) suggest that discriminant validity can commonly be assessed by analysing the shared variance between two constructs and verifying that
it is lower than the average variances extracted for each individual construct. Alternatively, another viable approach is to conduct ‘pairwise tests’ of all theoretically related constructs (Bagozzi and Phillips 1982; Anderson 1987). The pairwise analysis tests whether a “confirmatory factor analysis model representing two measures with two factors fits the data significantly better than a one-factor model” (Shook, Ketchen et al. 2004). The uniqueness of the constructs and therefore their level of discriminate validity can also be assessed using CFA. Hair, Black et al. (2006) recommends a technique whereby the variance extracted percentages for any two constructs is compared with the squared estimates between them. This test identifies that the construct adequately explains its item measures. This test is superior to alternative methods such as fixing the correlation between the constructs at one because high correlations can still produce significant differences.

5.11 Summary

Within this chapter, Structural Equation Modelling was introduced as the analysis method to test the proposed social marketing partnership model. After considering the advantages and disadvantages of the utilisation of online surveys, this method was chosen due to its positive characteristics such as ease of design and distribution when conducting research internationally.

A three step selection process was implemented to assist in the selection of appropriate previously validated reflective and formative item scales to represent the key social marketing constructs. This process involved evaluating the suitability of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) original scales and Macmillan, Money et al (2005) item scales which were developed in the non-profit sector. If the items scales of these two sources did not fit the construct definition previously developed the search was broadened to the most cited item scales in the marketing literature.

The sample population definition for this online survey was social marketing experts who had engaged in a social marketing partnerships in the last five years. To satisfy the sampling requirements for SEM a two tiered approach was adopted within this research. Within Tier one, the online survey was distributed to social marketers in ROI through the researcher’s indirect sampling frame and the NSMC e-newsletter.
A non-probability sampling strategy was employed, due to data protection reasons the researcher did not have access or control over the NSMC database to adopt a probability sampling strategy. As tier one did not fulfil the sampling requirements for this research 50–125, tier two was activated which broadened recruitment to the global social marketing population through the global social marketing list serve. Once the online survey was closed the results were integrated with SPSS through Survey Monkey, cleaned and the SEM analysis process began. The results of this analysis are discussed in the following chapter.
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6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the third and final phase of this research. It commences with a discussion of the respondent profile for the online survey in preparation for an analysis of the data through structural equation modelling (SEM). Before the SEM process could begin exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify how many factors best explain the data. This approach was followed by SEM whereby the measurement and structural models were tested. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how the hypothesis for this research can be interpreted based on these findings. This discussion begins with an outline of the profile of participants.

6.2 Respondent Profile

A total of 90 survey respondents participated in the online survey, 54 surveys were deemed usable for further analysis. Of the original 90, all survey participants fully completed the first screening question related to the social marketing benchmark criteria. However, eleven survey participants did not fulfil the criteria for inclusion, meaning they did not engage in at least five of the nine social marketing benchmark criteria activities sometimes, often or always. Additionally, seven survey respondents who had adequately fulfilled this criterion dropped out of the survey on their own merit before answering question two. Eight survey participants stated they had not participated in a behavioural change partnership in the last 5 years and were automatically directed to leave the online survey. A further six survey participants left the survey after completing the five screening questions even though they had fulfilled all the necessary criteria to participate. Finally, four survey respondents left the questionnaire after completing the commitment question. A summary of the non responses is provided in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 Summary of Non Responses to the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non response summary</th>
<th>Number of surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses to the online survey</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. who did not fulfil the benchmark criteria</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. who fulfilled criteria but left the survey themselves</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. who had not participated in a behavioural change partnership in the last 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. who left the questionnaire after fulfilling the criteria</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. who left after commitment question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total usable responses for further data analysis</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 Organisational Profile

Forty-nine of the organisations that the survey participants worked in had actively participated in behavioural change strategies for three or more years. As shown in Table 6.2, the majority of survey participants were located in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) followed by England. A minority worked outside the UK and ROI and were categorised as ‘other’ within the online survey. These countries included the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Japan.

Table 6.2 Location of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Partnership engagement profile

At the beginning of the survey a definition of social marketing partnerships was provided, the survey participants were instructed to think about one partner they had interacted the most with on a regular basis that fitted this definition. All the survey participants stated that they had participated in behavioural change partnerships in the last five years. They were subsequently asked a series of questions relating to their level of participation, knowledge, involvement and maturity of this behavioural change partnership. These responses are summarised in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3 Summary of Partnership Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledgeable (Knol)</th>
<th>Very Knol</th>
<th>Knol</th>
<th>Not Knol</th>
<th>Not at all Knol</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Highly involved</th>
<th>Involved</th>
<th>Involved to a degree</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Very mature</th>
<th>Mature</th>
<th>Somewhat mature</th>
<th>Immature</th>
<th>Very immature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.3, the majority of the participants rated themselves as ‘knowledgeable’ followed by ‘very knowledgeable’. None of the survey participants rated themselves as ‘not at all knowledgeable’ in relation to the behavioural change partnership they were thinking of. Four survey participants who indicated they were ‘not knowledgeable’ or ‘neutral’ were allowed to remain in the study as they also indicated that they were adequately involved in the behavioural change partnership.

The majority of respondents also rated themselves as highly involved or involved in the behavioural change partnership they were thinking of. As with knowledgeability
one respondent indicated they were not at all involved in the partnership they were thinking of, however they remained in the survey as they had previously indicated they were knowledgeable. Finally, the majority of behavioural change partnerships the survey participants were thinking of were rated as very mature or mature; only one respondent considered their partnership to be very immature.

The profile of the survey participants discussed in this section suggests that they were highly experienced and qualified individuals in the area of behavioural change partnerships. They had actively engaged with this type of partnership and were interpreted to be highly knowledgeable and involved.

The remainder of this chapter will analyse the responses of these experts using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

6.3 Structural Equation Modelling Data Analysis

A good fitting model is determined when the data collected within the survey is able to reproduce the model with minimal re-specifications. The proposed social marketing partnership model that was tested within this research is shown in Figure 6.1.

As previously identified in Chapter Four, a two-step approach for model testing was undertaken during the SEM process. The first step was to specify the relationships between the observed measures and the underlying constructs within the measurement model. The second step used a confirmatory structural model to specify the causal relationships between the constructs (Anderson and Gerbing 1988).

Prior to undertaking this two-step process, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify how many factors were needed to best explain the data. This analysis technique succeeded in defining the underlying structures within the data. Therefore it not only defined the dimensions of the data, it also determined the degree to which each variable was explained by the underlying dimension (Ghauri and Gronhaug 2010). EFA was also a process for creating summated scales as a data
reduction technique (Hair, Black et al. 2006). On completion of EFA, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was subsequently conducted on the factor loadings to test whether the factors adequately represented the data.

Figure 6.1 Proposed Social Marketing Partnership Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB = Mutual Benefits</th>
<th>SV = Shared Values</th>
<th>Com = Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC = Relationship Commitment</td>
<td>Tr = Trust</td>
<td>Mot = Expectation of Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop = Cooperation</td>
<td>Ten = Tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis

During the EFA process two techniques were used to assess the reflective and formative item scales. For reflective constructs (Relationship Commitment, Trust, Mutual Benefit, Shared Value and Expectancy of Continuance) a maximum likelihood technique was implemented. Maximum likelihood is an extraction technique that analyses the number of variables that cause variation. By conducting
a Maximum Likelihood technique the number of variables that were actually needed to accurately represent the data were assessed by interpreting their factor scores.

A principal components technique was used to interpret the dimensionality of the formative item scales (Communication, Trust and Tension). This technique transformed the interrelated items into a set of linear variables (Netemeyer, Bearden et al. 2003; Ghauri and Gronhaug 2010). The principal components technique assisted in reducing the large number of original items into a fewer number of principal components that represented the dimensions of the construct (Hair, Black et al. 2006). For example, in the case of tension, the 14 items were reduced into two principal components which were then used to interpret the data. The principal components also determined which item or items contributed the most information to each component.

As expected, the EFA identified that some of the constructs were unidimensional loading with one score (Mutual Benefits, Shared Values, Relationship Commitment, Expectation of Continuance and Cooperation); whilst others were multidimensional loading with two or more (Communication, Trust, Tension). With both maximum likelihood factor scores and principal components, additional labels were assigned to these multidimensional constructs to aid in their interpretation. A summary of the original constructs, the method undertaken to analyse the item scales, the number of resulting factor scores or components and their labels are available in Table 6.4. Further information such as all the factor scores and principal components used within this analysis is available in Appendix G.

When assessing formative or reflective item scales in all cases a highly significant factor loading or principal component loading had a score greater than $+/0.5$; however a loading of 0.4 is acceptable and was used within this research (Hair, Black et al. 2006).
Table 6.4 Summary of Factor Loadings and Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Technique adopted</th>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Loaded with</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Commitment</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>Predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Benefit</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Values</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Principal Component</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
<td>Type of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm_4</td>
<td>Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of Continuance</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mov_FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Principal Component</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>Principal Component</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ten_1</td>
<td>Strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ten_2,</td>
<td>Tension handling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this section provides an analysis of the factor loadings and principal components arising from the EFA on the item scales. The discussion within this section is limited to the multidimensional factors (trust, communication and tension). Items that are multidimensional contain multiple facets, therefore structure of these factors should be analysed to maintain the face validity of the measure.
6.3.1.1 Reflective Measures

By implementing standardised techniques, such as an oblique rotation more meaningful theoretical factors were achieved when using Maximum Likelihood analysis (Netemeyer, Bearden et al. 2003). This analysis also resulted in two outputs, namely the Pattern Matrix and Factor Structure Matrix. The Pattern matrix was chosen to interpret results because as the correlations among factors become greater it is more difficult to distinguish results using the Factor Structure Matrix (Hair, Black et al. 2006).

Trust was the only reflective measure that was interpreted to be multidimensional, the labels for each dimension of the trust is described within this section.

6.3.1.2 Trust

The trust item scale loaded on two factors. On deeper analysis three out of the six statements loaded to factor one, two to factor two, one did not load on either. All factor loadings for trust had a significance level above +/- 0.5 with the exception of one. It was not deemed necessary to delete this item from the scale. Based on the information contained within factors one and two and the outcomes of phase one and phase two of this research labels were assigned to factors one and two.

Three trust items loaded to Factor 1 as identified in Table 6.5. The item that loaded the strongest (0.999) assessed the future of partnerships in times of uncertainty. The other two items measured dependability and credibility of the partner. Collectively, this factor was interpreted to measure reliability as one component of trust and was labelled same. Within both the literature and case study analysis, reliability was strongly supported as an indicator of a trusting relationship. If a partner was reliable they fulfilled the roles expected of them.

Two additional item scales loaded to a second factor also shown in Table 6.3, both of which were associated with the reverse coded items within the trust scale. After reviewing the content of these items, they were labelled as predictability. Predictability was also supported in both the social marketing literature and case
study as an important facet of trust. Predictability of partners remains important to establish an understanding amongst partners as to how to interpret behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know that our partner will always be willing to offer my organisation the support it may need.</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our partner would not let us down, even if they found themselves in an unforeseen situation (e.g. competition from other funders, changes in government policy).</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am confident that our partner will be thoroughly dependable, especially when it comes to things that are important to my organisation.</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>I can never be sure what our partner is going to surprise us with next.</td>
<td>Predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our partner is very unpredictable. I never know how they are going to act from one day to the next.</td>
<td>Predictability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1.4 Formative Measures

Principal component analysis was chosen as a method to address the formative measures as they contained a lot of information that needed to be summarised for predictive purposes (Hair, Black et al. 2006). The analysis of the item scales is shown below.

6.3.1.5 Communication

The EFA indicated that 14 items within the communication scale loaded across four components. Based on the information contained within each component contained, these were subsequently labelled expectations, information sharing, type of
information and changes. Table 6.6 summaries these components all of which were significant above the +/0.4 threshold.

Principal Component 1 (Comm_1) was labelled as expectations. The necessity of managing expectations was notarised both in the findings of the Case Study and the Literature Review. The communication of expectations relates to an understanding of how the partner perceives the other to behalf. These expectations can relate to verbal or written agreements.

The next dimension of communication (Comm_2) was labelled information sharing the type and intensity of information shared has an impact on how communication is perceived.

One item loaded on each of the third and fourth principal components, they were labelled as type of information and changes. Like the other two components they are supported by the literature and case study findings.

Table 6.6 Communication Components and Labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component1</td>
<td>The terms of our relationship have been written down in detail.</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The partners expectations of us are communicated in detail.</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this relationship, it is expected that any information which might help the other party will be provided.</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This partner keeps us fully informed about issues that affect our activities.</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>In coordinating our activities with this partner, formal communication channels are followed (i.e. channels are regularized and structured modes versus casual, informal and word-of-</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms of our relationship have been explicitly verbalised and discussed.

We inform our partner in advance of changing needs.

We do not volunteer much information regarding our activities to our partner.

**Component 3**

It is expected that the parties will only provide information according to pre-specified agreements.

**Component 4**

The parties are expected to keep each other informed about events or changes that may affect the other party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is expected that the parties will only provide information according to pre-specified agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The parties are expected to keep each other informed about events or changes that may affect the other party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.1.6 Cooperation

The EFA indicated the 17 items in the cooperation scale loaded on 4 principal components. On closer examination, 15 of the items loaded on component one, one item loaded on component 3 and one item on component 4. For this reason only one component was shown to represent cooperation in the proposed social marketing partnership model. This component will remain labelled cooperation.

### 6.3.1.7 Tension

The 16 tension items loaded across two components as shown in Table 6.7. The tension item scale included in the online survey included two facets, the first measured the activities that could cause tension, and the second measured how tension was handled within the partnership. As expected this dichotomy was reflected in the principal components. All the statements that loaded on component one belonged to the question that asked about the causes of tension. These statements were all highly significant above 0.6 with the exception of branding which was still significant at 0.555. The remainder of statements loaded on Factor 2. These statements related to part two of the tension item scale which asked respondents about tension handling.
Table 6.7 Tension Components and Labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1</strong></td>
<td>Ownership of the partnership</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of funding</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic direction</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals of the partnership</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-monetary resource allocation</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciding on actions</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How goals and direction can be achieved</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason for the partnership</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power balance within the partnership</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2</strong></td>
<td>... is good at solving disputes before they create problems in our working relationship.</td>
<td>Tension handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... makes sure that problems do not arise in our working relationship.</td>
<td>Tension handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... has the ability to openly discuss solutions when problems arise.</td>
<td>Tension handling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor scores resulting from both the maximum likelihood technique and the principal components contained as much information as the original items and therefore replaced them in the proposed social marketing partnership model prior to the SEM analysis. Figure 6.2 illustrates the Measurement model incorporating factor scores. Resulting from the EPA the model contained 25 variables (15 endogenous and 10 exogenous) and 11 unobservable which were specified. These unobserved variables account for information that is not contained in the model and are shown in the small circles labelled from e1 – e11. To differentiate between the unidimensional and multidimensional variables the factors or summated scales are presented separately within the model also shown in Figure 6.2. For example, the multidimensional latent variable Trust is represented as Tr_1 and Tr_2.
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To validate the factor loadings represented within this model the results obtained through confirmatory factor analysis will be discussed in the following section.

Figure 6.2 The Measurement Model Incorporating Factor Scores

*Rectangles have been used to represent the unobserved latent variables instead of eclipses as factor scores have been computed meaning AMOS treats these scores as observable variables

6.6.2 Measurement Model

Prior to conducting CFA, two checks were undertaken to ensure that the assumptions of the analysis were fulfilled. Firstly the data was checked for normality and secondly for outliers. Using the value of seven to guide the assessment of univariate normality no item was shown to be substantially kurtomic, mutual benefit slightly exceeded 7 with a measure of 7.7682 however, this was not considered to be extreme (Byrne 2001). A critical ratio value of greater than 5 is indicative of nonnormally distributed data, in this instance it is recorded to be close to 6 (6.47). Therefore caution must be taken when interpreting the Maximum Likelihood distribution (Bentler and Yuan 1999).
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The data was searched for univariate or multivariate outliers. Outliers are present when the scores from the Likert scales are different from the other respondents. The Mahalanobis d-squared test was run to detect for multivariate outliers, this test showed minimal evidence of serious multivariate outliers, meaning the scores within the items scales remained similar.

6.6.2.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To test the underlying relationships between the constructs CFA was used to test the specification of the proposed social marketing model (Figure 6.2). Four goodness of fit indices were used to evaluate the model and are shown in Table 6.8. These indices provided information relating to how well the model was specified given the available data (Fan, Thompson et al. 1999).

Table 6.8 Fit Indices for the Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes made from the previous test</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Model</td>
<td>139.21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>0.23 (Low 0.19-0.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that the Chi-square goodness of fit does not approximate the degrees of freedom; this is an indication that there is an inadequate model fit. The other fit indices presented within Table 6.8 also suggest the data does not adequately fit the model. The CFI is low and far away from 0.09 which suggests that significant amounts of variance remain to be explained (Bagozzi and Foxall 1996). Similarly the TIL does not approach 1 as required. However, caution must be taken when interpreting this data as TIL and RMSEA measures can over reject models with small sample sizes (Hu and Bentler 1999; Byrne 2001). The RMSEA is below the recommended 0.05 which is indicative of a good model fit however the other goodness of fit indices do not support the specification of this model.
This analysis indicated that the data does not reasonably fit with the model and therefore requires re-specification. Before the model is re-specified the maximum likelihood loadings were also assessed for model fit.

The maximum likelihood regression weights presented in Table 6.9 suggest that six of 29 proposed relationships in the measurement model are statistically significant. One more is significant at the 10% level (1.69) which is acceptable given the small sample size. These relationships have been highlighted in bold. Within this research statistical significance was assessed with a critical ratio greater than 1.96 and a P value less than 0.1. The estimates refer to the size of change within the measure.

Table 6.9 Maximum Likelihood Loadings for the Proposed Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>.0586</td>
<td>.1527</td>
<td>.3835 .7014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>-.1431</td>
<td>.1296</td>
<td>-1.1039 .2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>-.0140</td>
<td>.1507</td>
<td>-.0927 .9262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>.5675</td>
<td>.1279</td>
<td>4.4360 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>.0979</td>
<td>.1371</td>
<td>.7135 .4755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>-.0708</td>
<td>.1164</td>
<td>-.6078 .5433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>-.0142</td>
<td>.1379</td>
<td>-.1026 .9183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>-.1203</td>
<td>.1171</td>
<td>-1.0275 .3042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>-.0694</td>
<td>.1305</td>
<td>-.5314 .5952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>-.0050</td>
<td>.1186</td>
<td>-.0422 .9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>.2046</td>
<td>.1210</td>
<td>1.6916 .0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>.3247</td>
<td>.1268</td>
<td>2.5604 .0105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>.1232</td>
<td>.1311</td>
<td>.9400 .3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>-.1243</td>
<td>.1200</td>
<td>-1.0357 .3003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>.4328</td>
<td>.1237</td>
<td>3.4977 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2</td>
<td>-.0320</td>
<td>.1323</td>
<td>-.2417 .8090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_1</td>
<td>.0805</td>
<td>.1271</td>
<td>.6336 .5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2</td>
<td>.2688</td>
<td>.1323</td>
<td>2.0310 .0423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_1</td>
<td>-.3731</td>
<td>.1271</td>
<td>-2.9356 .0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov_FS</td>
<td>-.3427</td>
<td>.1109</td>
<td>-3.0914 .0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these results indicate that not all the specified relationships are statistically significant, the findings from both phase 1 and phase 2 of this research strongly
support their existence. Due to the small sample size a cautionary approach should be adopted when interpreting the findings and a re-specification process should take place before inferences are made.

Based on the interpretation of the Maximum Likelihood loadings (Table 6.9) and the goodness of fit statistics presented in Table 6.8 the decision was taken to re-specify the model by introducing modifications. These modifications will be discussed in the following section.

### 6.6.3 Model Re-specification

During the re-specification process it should be noted that the decisions to implement the prescribed modifications were based on statistical analysis and also underlying theory that supported the changes. Modification Indices (MI) were used to guide the re-specification process as large MI’s argue for cross loadings and error covariance’s. In this case, large MI values were interpreted to be larger than 10, however, these changes were only made if they were supported by theory. Table 6.10 summarises the re-specification process.

Table 6.10 shows that five modification steps were taken during the re-specification process each of which resulted in an improvement in the fit of the model. One change was made at a time to avoid over specifying the model and to assess the effects of the modifications. All five modifications involved adding additional paths, none were deleted.

The first re-specification implemented was to introduce a direct path from Com_1 which has been relabelled Expectations to Cooperation. This path was not originally proposed as the case study suggested that trust was a mediating variable for cooperation. However, as a result of the EFA, Expectations became one dimension of communication. Reflecting on the outcome of the case study, the management of expectations played a key role within the partnerships. When expectations were not met trust diminished which resulted in diminished cooperation. However, on the occasions where expectations were effectively communicated cooperation between the partners did manifest. Cooperative behaviours call for interdependence between
parties which is ultimately aligned with the management of expectations, through a willingness to share of tangible and intangible resources. With careful communication of expectations between partners the cooperative behaviours should be apparent and therefore diminishes the need for a direct mediated path through trust. For these reasons this modification was accepted.

Table 6.10 Summary of Re-specification Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes made from the previous test</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Model</td>
<td>139.22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.178</td>
<td>0.23 (Low 0.19 - 0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification 1</td>
<td>99.61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.19 (Low 0.14 - 0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Comm_1 (Expectations) – Coop_1</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.15 (Low 0.10 - 0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification 3</td>
<td>67.26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.14 (Low 0.0914 - 0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add e9 - e1</td>
<td>62.44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.134 (Low 0.835 - 0.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification 5</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.1156 (Low 0.06 - 0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-specified Model</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.1156 (Low 0.06 - 0.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring back to Table 6.10, as a consequence, of this modification the chi-square dropped closer to the degrees of freedom (df = 36) from 139.22 to 99.61 indicating an improvement in model fit. There was also an improvement within the other goodness of fit statistics particularly the CFI.

The second modification that was implemented was a direct path from Shared Values to Cooperation. Within the literature review, particularly when discussing the social marketing partnership taxonomies the concept of shared values was continuously emphasised. Organisations whose goals converge or share similar values had a pre-established level of trust, for example, Legarde, Doner et al. (2005)
suggested that similar entities such as NGOs have a greater goal convergence. These shared values therefore would be linked with a willingness to share resources. Within the case study, organisations who had lower shared values, needed to build a trusting relationship with their partner which lead to cooperation. With high shared values, trust was implicit in the relationship and therefore a direct path to cooperation is feasible. Similarly to the previous example this path had a positive effect on all the goodness of fit statistics.

The inclusion of direct paths between Comm_1 (Expectations) and Cooperation and Shared Values and Cooperation, were the only two modifications that had the power to produce a significant effect on the model fit by introducing direct paths between the factors. As shown in Table 6.10, three additional modifications were implemented. By correlating the variances that were not tested within the model, the fit of the model improved, however the changes were not as great as the first two modifications. Other modifications between variances were suggested however, they did were not supported by theory and therefore were not implemented.

The next section discusses the implications this re-specification has had on the proposed social marketing partnership model.

6.4 Discussion

The path diagram for the final re-specified model is shown in Figure 6.3. An assessment of the fit of the re-specified model can be better understood by comparing the fit indices results between the proposed (Figure 6.2) and the re-specified model (Figure 6.3). These results are provided in Table 6.11, they suggest that there is a better fit between the data and the re-specified model.

The results show that the Chi-square and the degrees of freedom are much closer to each other in the re-specified model; this is an indicator of a better fitting model. This is also supported when comparing the other Goodness of Fit indices.
Table 6.11 Comparison of the fit indices between the proposed and re-specified model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Model</th>
<th>Re-specified Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Sq</td>
<td>139.22</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.2326 (Lo 0.1925 – 0.2740) PCLOSE 0</td>
<td>0.12 (Lo 0.59 – 0.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CFI which is independent of sample size is closer to 0.9 in the re-specified model which is indicative of a good fit. This suggests there is less variance in the model than when it was previously tested. The CFI result (0.86) also supports the researchers choice not to further modify the model as measures greater than 0.9 may result in over-fitting (Bagozzi and Foxall 1996). The TLI is also closer to 1 in the re-specified model indicating a good fitting model. The lower RMSEA also corroborates the better model fit.

Regression weights can also be used to assess the model fit whilst assisting in interpreting the research hypothesis that were empirically tested within this research.

**6.4.1 Research Hypotheses**

The regression weights presented in Table 6.12 also suggest an improvement in the fit of the model with 10 out of 31 relationships shown to be statistically significant. The previous regression weights (see Table 6.9) supported 6 out of 21 relationships. The 10 additional relationships manifested from the modifications described earlier.
Figure 6.3 Re-specified Social Marketing Partnership Model

RC.FC = Relationship Commitment

Tr.1  Trust
Tr.2

MB_FS = Mutual Benefits

SV_FS = Shared Values

Comm.1  Communication
Comm.2
Comm.3

Mov_FS = Expectation of Continuance

Coop.1 = Cooperation

Ten.1  Tension
Ten.2

*Rectangles have been used to represent the constructs instead of eclipses as Factor Scores have been computed
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Table 6.12 Re-specified Model Regression Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>--- SV_FS</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>.1406</td>
<td>.1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>--- SV_FS</td>
<td>-.1431</td>
<td>.1296</td>
<td>-1.1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>--- Comm_1</td>
<td>.0954</td>
<td>.1379</td>
<td>.6917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>--- Comm_1</td>
<td>.5675</td>
<td>.1279</td>
<td>4.4360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>--- Comm_2</td>
<td>-.0787</td>
<td>.1253</td>
<td>-.6282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>--- Comm_2</td>
<td>-.0708</td>
<td>.1164</td>
<td>-.6078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td>--- Comm_3</td>
<td>-.0675</td>
<td>.1261</td>
<td>-.5354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2</td>
<td>--- Comm_3</td>
<td>-.1203</td>
<td>.1171</td>
<td>-1.0275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>--- MB_FS</td>
<td>.0348</td>
<td>.1210</td>
<td>.2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>--- Tr_1</td>
<td>-.0270</td>
<td>.1165</td>
<td>-.2320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>--- Tr_2</td>
<td>.1634</td>
<td>.1213</td>
<td>1.3469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS</td>
<td>--- SV_FS</td>
<td>.2942</td>
<td>.1183</td>
<td>2.4866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>--- RC_FS</td>
<td>-.1478</td>
<td>.0643</td>
<td>-2.2994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>--- Tr_1</td>
<td>.1758</td>
<td>.0767</td>
<td>2.2904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>--- Tr_2</td>
<td>-.0320</td>
<td>.1292</td>
<td>-.2476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2</td>
<td>--- Tr_1</td>
<td>.0805</td>
<td>.1241</td>
<td>.6489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_1</td>
<td>--- Tr_2</td>
<td>.2688</td>
<td>.1325</td>
<td>2.0276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2</td>
<td>--- Tr_2</td>
<td>-.3731</td>
<td>.1273</td>
<td>-2.9303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov_FS</td>
<td>--- RC_FS</td>
<td>-.3198</td>
<td>.1009</td>
<td>-3.1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>--- Comm_1</td>
<td>.5247</td>
<td>.0799</td>
<td>6.5678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1</td>
<td>--- SV_FS</td>
<td>.4442</td>
<td>.0733</td>
<td>6.0617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon closer examination of these regression weights, there are a number of findings that are particularly relevant to this research, particularly when analysed in relation to the eight previously stated research hypotheses. These research hypotheses are outlined in Table 6.13. Of the eight empirically tested hypotheses, three research were shown to be supported (H2, H6, H7), one was partially supported (H8) and four were not supported (H1, H3, H4,H5).
Table 6.13 Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported/ Unsupported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 There is a positive relationship between mutual benefits and relationship commitment.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 There is a positive relationship between shared values and relationship commitment.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 There is a positive relationship between shared values and trust.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 There is a positive relationship between communication and trust.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and expectations of continuance.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and cooperation.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 There is a positive relationship between trust and cooperation.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 There is a negative relationship between trust and tension.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The critical ratio and P-values in Table 6.12 suggest that H2, H6 and H7 were supported by the findings.

**H2** There is a positive relationship between shared values and relationship Commitment.

The definitions of social marketing partnerships discussed in Chapter Two identified the sharing of values as one of the central tenets of partnership development (Niblett 2005; Donovan and Henley 2010). This sharing of values inherently motivates social marketers to commit to the partnership as they are working towards a common purpose. It is this synergy that ensures that the partnership are high impact (Weinreich 1999; Crutchfield and Mc Leod Grant 2008; Weinreich 2011). In Rothschild, Richie et al. (2000) typology of non-profit competition, shared values was an inherent part of the decision to adopt a collegial strategy or compete.
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The relationship between shared values and commitment was also supported in the Get Your Life into Gear (GYLG) case study. Reflecting on the different types of partners involved and the concept of shared values; arguably organisations with similar values were identified to be more committed to the project. They were also more willing to openly pledge their commitment as identified by the actions of the advisory groups. Reflecting on the concept of shared values and commitment between the GYLG strategic partners and the respective pilot sites, the two were able to form a relationship around a commonality. However the same level of shared values were not present and neither was the same level of commitment to the pilot initiative.

Unlike the relationship between shared values and commitment, the model did not support the relationship between shared values and trust (reliability and predictability).

**H3** There is a positive relationship between shared values and trust

For similar reasons to those expressed above, the researcher believes there is still an underlying relationship between shared values and trust. The social marketing literature suggested that organisations that shared values were also considered to experience high levels of trust (Himmelman 2001; Hastings 2003; Legarde, Doner *et al.* 2005). This assertion was also supported in the case study. For organisations who shared values there was an inherent level of trust present as all parties were working towards mutual goals. The level of trust, particularly at the formative stages of the relationship was not as high for the partners who did not share values.

The fact that this relationship was unsupported is however, not unfounded. One of the modifications that was implemented as part of the re-specification process drew a direct path from shared values to cooperation. This new relationship which was not previously hypothesised exhibited the second highest critical ratio. If what the social marketing literature suggests is correct, that organisations who’s goals converge have a high level of trust (Legarde, Doner *et al.* 2005), trust may not be needed as a mediating variable. This would support the rational to bypass trust as a mediating variable and accept the direct path between shared values and cooperation. During
the GYLG pilot initiative, the organisations who may not have had a previous longstanding relationship with safe\textsubscript{food}, however did have similar values were immediately willing to share resources within the initiative. The pilot sites did exhibit an enthusiasm at the formative stage of the programme and whilst they did cooperate, the same level of trust was not there as shared values was not present.

Two other relationships related to cooperation were also supported in the model, H6 and H7.

**H6** There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and cooperation  
**H7** There is a positive relationship between trust and cooperation

The relationship between relationship commitment and trust and cooperation was heavily supported within the social marketing literature and in particular the Get Your Life into Gear (GYLG) case study. Within the case study cooperation manifested in the sharing of tangible and intangible resources, this willingness to share resources was influenced by the presence of commitment and trust. Reverting back to the discussions relating to the implementation partners (See section 4.6); at certain points in the partnership the level of trust decreased as the pilot leaders felt that the pilot site managers were not committed to the project or cooperating. However, when the managers were available (particularly in Pilot Site A) and highly cooperative, the project leaders no longer questioned the level of trust or commitment in the partnership.

The hypothesised relationship between trust and tension was partially supported within the re-specified model.

**H8** There is a negative relationship between trust and tension

Following the EFA both Trust and Tension were shown to have two factor loadings/principal components (see section 6.3.1 p.238). As a result, the two facets of trust were labelled Reliability (Tr\_1) and Predictability (Tr\_2) and the two facets of Tension were labelled Tension (Ten\_1) and Tension Handling (Ten\_2).
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The re-specified model showed that the relationship between reliability (Tr_1), tension and tension handling was not supported. The relationship between predictability (Tr_2) tension and tension handling was supported. This finding can be interpreted to mean that when partners are predictable there is little tension related to strategy development. Also, when partners are less predictable there is a greater necessity for conflict handling.

The relationship between communication and trust was shown to be partially supported.

**H4** There is a positive relationship between communication & trust

Trust, measured as reliability and predictability was hypothesised to have a positive relationship with Communication measured as Expectations, information sharing and type of information (see section 6.3.1). The data suggests that there is a positive relationship between predictability and expectations. Within the social marketing literature the need to manage the expectations of the partners is paramount (Legarde, Doner *et al.* 2005). The case study also supported the assertion that when these expectations are not effectively communicated the level of trust within the relationship decreases.

The relationship between the facets of trust (reliability) and communication (Information sharing and information type) were not supported. However, this could be related to the partner prioritising the communications. Within the social marketing literature, Himmelman (2000) indicated that information sharing was one of the resources that was shared at one of the first points on the partnership continuum (Himmelman 2001). As the majority of participants in the online survey stated the behavioural change partnership they were thinking of was mature or very mature (see section 6.2), the lack of significance of information sharing could be attributed to the fact that their relationship had moved beyond this point. The case study also, supports this assertion, whereby stakeholders who did not become partners with **safefood** were willing to share information with the organisation. Also at the beginning of the partnership for the External Advisory Group, the first meeting was used to share information and from that point the sharing of resources
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intensified. The researcher does not assert that the role of information sharing should be discounted however, perhaps the respondents felt that communicating expectations was more important.

Associated with this issue, one of the newly specified direct paths that were not previously hypothesised in this research suggests there is a positive relationship between communication of expectation and cooperation. This direct path was identified as most significant in the model.

The researcher hypothesised that communication was mediated through trust. However, more specifically, when referring to the communication of expectations trust as a mediating variable may not be needed. The scales that contributed to communication of expectations were associated with formal written agreements and the explicit articulation of the expectations of the parties involved. When the roles and responsibilities are clearly defined trust may not be needed as a mediating factor and with this agreement having a positive impact on cooperation. As previously stated cooperative is related interdependence between parties which is aligned with the management of expectations, through a willingness to share of tangible and intangible resources. This finding was supported in the literature through Legarde, Doner et al.’s (2005) taxonomy; however it was not supported within the case study. Although the project leaders continually verbalised the expectations of each partner, when they were written down in a formal agreement, this communication damaged the relationship. These types of documents were standard practice for safefood, for other organisations they may not be. Other methods were also used to articulate expectations in a less formal manner, the researcher would agree that the minutes of meetings helped assist in maintaining active cooperation from all parties involved.

Two hypothesised relationships were shown to be unsupported. The first was the relationship between mutual benefits and relationship commitment.

**H1** There is a positive relationship between mutual benefits and relationship commitment

The social marketing literature suggests in order to motivate an organisation to participate in a partnership mutual benefits must exist (Niblett 2005; French 2010;
Weinreich 2011). The organisation must receive something in exchange for participation. This hypothesis could remain unsupported due to the principles of social marketing which focuses on the good of society as opposed the benefits incurred for participation. Although, this hypothesis was rejected the researcher argues that mutual benefit should undergo further testing particularly in relation to Public private partnerships which was outside the boundaries of the research. From discussing the pilot initiative with the managers in the pilot site they would not have participated if the correct value propositions had not been introduced by the project leaders. The members of the external advisory group also benefited from participation, in terms of fulfilling organisational objectives or fulfilling policy recommendations.

Hypothesis 5, the relationship between Relationship Commitment and Expectations of Continuance was also unsupported.

**H5** There is a positive relationship between relationship commitment and expectations of continuance

Now that the research hypotheses have been discussed, the remaining sections examines other test that were adopted to measure the fit of the re-specified model.

### 6.4.2 Standardised Regression Weights

The standardised Regression Weights shown in Table 6.14 are acceptable as all the estimates are less than 1. When interpreting standardised regression weights all scores are set between $+/-. 1$ with the higher the number the greater the effect. The sign is irrelevant in this case as the power of the effect is the priority. The table shows that the relationship between trust and Communication_1 has the greatest effect, followed by shared value on relationship commitment.
### 6.4.3 Shared Covariance’s

In Table 6.15, the 6 highlighted examples are shown to have statistical associations between them (i.e. SV_FS and Comm_1) in terms of shared covariance’s. This could be attributed to commonalities amongst variables that were not tested within the model. These commonalities are common as it is not possible to account for everything in the model. For instance, too many variables would lead to a model that was not parsimonious (Hooper, Coughlan *et al.* 2010). Residual variances (i.e. the relationship between e11 and e2) are not explained within the model and are created by elements that were not measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1 &lt;--- SV_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2 &lt;--- SV_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1 &lt;--- Comm_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2 &lt;--- Comm_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1 &lt;--- Comm_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2 &lt;--- Comm_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1 &lt;--- Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_2 &lt;--- Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS &lt;--- MB_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS &lt;--- Tr_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS &lt;--- Tr_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC_FS &lt;--- SV_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1 &lt;--- RC_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1 &lt;--- Tr_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1 &lt;--- Tr_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2 &lt;--- Tr_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_1 &lt;--- Tr_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_2 &lt;--- Tr_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten_1 &lt;--- Tr_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov_FS &lt;--- RC_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1 &lt;--- Comm_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop_1 &lt;--- SV_FS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6.15 Shared Covariance’s Re-specified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1348</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1348</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
<td>-1.287</td>
<td>.1359</td>
<td>-0.9468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>-0.0870</td>
<td>.1353</td>
<td>-0.6433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>.4109</td>
<td>.1461</td>
<td>2.8127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1348</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
<td>-0.1159</td>
<td>.1333</td>
<td>-0.8697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>-0.0185</td>
<td>.1324</td>
<td>-0.1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>.3865</td>
<td>.1426</td>
<td>2.7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>.3371</td>
<td>.1402</td>
<td>2.4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>-.3033</td>
<td>.1199</td>
<td>-2.5293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e7</td>
<td>e9</td>
<td>.1299</td>
<td>.0602</td>
<td>2.1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e11</td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.3382</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>2.9645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4 Shared Correlations

The factor correlations in Table 6.16 should not be interpreted as indicative of statistical significance instead the correlations only suggest the size of the effect if these relationships were implemented.

Table 6.16 Factor Correlations Re-specified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm_2</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV_FS</td>
<td>Comm_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm_1</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>Comm_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB_FS</td>
<td>SV_FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>e1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e7</td>
<td>e9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e11</td>
<td>e2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Definition of social marketing partnerships

Out of the 52 survey participants 45 provided their interpretation of the definition of a behavioural change partnership. There was an inconsistency in the definitions provided however recurring themes did manifest. Amongst the majority of participants partnerships meant two or more entities working together for a common goal or purpose. They were deemed to share values and benefit from participation. These themes arose both in the social marketing literature and case study. However, unlike Nibblett’s (2005) definition the need for a formal contract was not stipulated.

6.5 Chapter Overview

The data presented within this chapter illustrated that with five modifications the proposed social marketing partnership model was shown to have a better fit. Overall of the eight research hypotheses, three were supported (H2, H6, H7), one was partially supported (H8) and four were not supported (H1, H3, H4, H5). Two new paths that were not previously hypothesised were shown to have the highest statistical significance. These two paths were, the direct relationship between shared values and cooperation and the relationship between Communication of Expectations and Cooperation.

Now that all three phases of the research methodology are complete, the final chapter will discuss the conclusions, implications and the recommendations of the research.
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7.1 Introduction

The type of social change needed to address the complex, wicked issues that are permeating today’s society cannot be facilitated without the adoption of social marketing partnership approaches. Systemic change of this kind adopts a market with mentality which can only be implemented through the simultaneous integration of change endeavours between all levels of the social marketing system (up, mid and down stream). For these reasons, social marketing partnerships now play a vital role in most behavioural change interventions, and are subsequently referred to as the 5th P in the social marketing mix.

This recognition however, is juxtaposed with the reality that the practical and theoretical development of social marketing partnerships has been inhibited by a scarcity of empirical research in the area. This lack of evidence to support the application of social marketing partnerships has contributed to ambiguity related to its role and definition. It has also resulted in calls for a partnership template to ensure that the potential of social marketing partnerships can be realised particularly when faced with wicked issues such as obesity, global warming and poverty; which if not addressed will evolve to become super wicked in nature. The current research seeks to address this call through the development of a social marketing partnership framework. The remainder of this chapter will discuss the key findings and conclusions arising from this research.

7.2 Conclusions

By addressing the primary and secondary objectives of this researcher, the researcher succeeded in theoretically underpinning the conceptualisation of social marketing partnerships. This conceptualisation is discussed within this section.
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7.2.1 Secondary Objectives

*Secondary Objective 1:* To identify the key milestones pertaining to the evolution of social marketing partnership development including the implications this change has on:

- The roles undertaken by participants.
- The selection and interaction processes related to social marketing partnership formation.
- The types of partnership engagement.

Three dominant eras of social marketing partnership thought have emerged since the disciplines conception. These eras are referred to as the *Period of Coordination (1970 – 1990)*, *Period of Formalisation (1990’s – 2000)* and most recently *Period of Integrated Systems (2000 – present)*. From the 1970s to the present time these eras symbolise a shift in perspective from a traditional individual micro marketing approach towards a total market approach (TMA) which integrates the role of the individual and society.

7.2.1.1 Period of Coordination (1970 – 1990)

During this era the term partnership did not manifest instead references were made to cooperation and coordination of strategies. There was also little discussion of the characteristics of partnership strategies, however; coordination of efforts was usually discussed within the context of the marketing mix, particularly when referring to place and product. Intermediaries was the preferred term used to describe these types of partners. Intermediaries supported the implementation of campaigns; however, there was minimal discussion of the longer term implications of these relationships which suggested they only lasted in the short term. The advantage of engaging with intermediaries within an intervention was associated with the optimisation of existing distribution networks which ensured the message reached the target audience.
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As an outcome of successful relationships with intermediaries, towards the end of the period of coordination, social marketers began to appreciate the role of interpersonal networks within change endeavours. However, this evolution in mindset did not fully come into fruition until the period of formalisation.

7.2.1.2 Period of Formalisation (1990’s – 2000)

Within the period of formalisation, the term partnership became more prominent within the social marketing literature however; the discussion of partnership characteristics or its definition remained scarce. During this era social marketers accepted the role of the environment in changing behaviours resulting in problems being framed as issues. Social marketers undertook a formalised approach to developing partnerships once realising that change endeavours could have a greater impact through co-creation of change and the sharing of resources. However, as partnership endeavours incorporated down (individual) and up (policy led) stream change programmes, there was little coordination across and between levels in the social marketing system.

7.2.1.3 Period of Integrated Systems (2000 – present)

The first instance of social marketing partnerships being referred to as the 5th P in the social marketing mix is evident in the early 2000s. Social marketers were aware of issues growing more complex in nature leading to the manifestation of references to social change strategies as opposed to behavioural change. This shift in perspective increased the number of potential direct and indirect stakeholders involved with the issue, and in turn shifted the emphasis within change strategies from short isolated interventions to long term transformations. Social marketing partnerships were increasingly utilised to promote institutional change across multiple settings, therefore tasked with creating awareness amongst individuals, as well as dismantling environmental barriers.

During this era, there was a proliferation of discussions relating to social marketing partnerships both within the social marketing literature and in academic conferences compared to the two previous eras. The majority of the debate surrounding social
marketing partnerships remains centred on its practical application as opposed to its conceptual development. This has fuel calls for a social marketing partnership template. This periodisation suggests that, as social marketers continue to respond to increasingly complex social issues, social marketing partnerships will become even more pertinent due to the interconnectedness of issues.

Within this periodisation the researcher was unable to clearly define the term social marketing partnerships as its meaning often remains implicit in the text. However, a small number of authors did provide an explicit interpretation of social marketing partnerships, an analysis of which could assist in eradicating ambiguity relating to the term. Secondly, in the absence of a social marketing partnership framework, social marketers have begun to use social marketing partnership taxonomies to insist in their interpretation and implementation of the strategy. The implications of applying these taxonomies however, have not undergone empirically testing.

**Secondary Objective 2: To analyse the boundaries of social marketing partnerships through an examination of the different definitions and terms of reference adopted by practitioners and academics.**

Social marketing partnerships remain a nebulous term that has been loosely used to describe a range of relationships between two parties. The findings from both the literature review and case study demonstrate partnerships to be a dynamic concept that remains difficult to define as the boundaries of social marketing partnerships continue to evolve. Table 7.1 provides a summary of the dominant characteristics arising from the limited number of social marketing partnership definitions that are published in the social marketing literature. In the absence of a consensus on the definition of social marketing partnerships, these characteristics can assist in differentiating what does and does not qualify.
Table 7.1 Summary of Dominant Characteristics in the Social Marketing Partnership Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared interest/values</th>
<th>Sharing of resources (tangible and in tangible)</th>
<th>Equality</th>
<th>Formal Agreement</th>
<th>Focus on the social marketing issue</th>
<th>Prioritise Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niblett (2005)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niblett (2005)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovan &amp; Henley (2010)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinrich (1999)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (2010)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 suggests that the two dominant characteristics that permeate the available social marketing partnership definitions are shared values and the sharing of resources.

Based on the analysis of the literature and case study one of the preferred definitions provided by Niblett (2003 p.23) defines partnerships within social marketing as:

"...an organisation associated with another (or others) in a common activity or interest; implying a relationship which each organisation has equal status and a certain independence but has a spoken or formal obligation to the other(s)."

This definition remains broad allowing for the continued evolution of the definition of social marketing partnerships over time. Such a definition is useful to
differentiate other dominant types of relationships evident within the social marketing such as stakeholders. Stakeholders are identified to be directly and indirectly related to the change endeavour through a commonality however, are not formally engaged in the development or delivery of the solution and considered passive participators.

This research showed that the reality of business practices makes it difficult to mobilise every relationship from the status of a stakeholder to an active partner. The case study identified the importance of choosing partners who strategically fit the organisation and share values within the change endeavour. By restricting partnership selection to around ten organisations within the case study, the management process was made easier in terms of communication and arranging meetings. Too many partners can become counterproductive due to the duplication of resources and the difficulty related to assigning roles and responsibilities.

**Secondary Objective 3: To delineate the different social marketing partnership taxonomies.**

In the absence of a consensus on the definition of social marketing partnerships, four taxonomies have emerged in an attempt to classify the key social marketing partnership processes.

**7.2.3.1 Taxonomy One: Typology of Non–Profit Competition (Rothschild, Richie et al. 2000)**

The typology of non-profit competition provides insight into the strategic decision making processes of organisations when competing in a hypercompetitive marketplace. Combative (compete) and collegial (cooperation) competition are illustrated as opposite ends of a continuum. Key characteristics for non–profits when contemplating cooperative strategies with other organisations include shared values, motivation, cooperation and mutual benefit. When these characteristics are not evident conflict between parties increases which motivates the choice instead to compete.
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7.2.3.2 Taxonomy Two: A Partnership Continuum (Donovan and Henley 2010)

This continuum differs from the Typology of Non-Profit competition as it focuses on the intensity of the coalition assessed through the allocation of resources (time, trust and turf) for organisations working together in a common purpose. It is a developmental continuum meaning that as the investment increases so does the intensity of the partnership. This taxonomy provides an insight into the resource intensity of partnership development, whilst introducing the notion of differing degrees of partnership working based on resource allocation.

7.2.3.3 Taxonomy Three: Goal Convergence, Trust and Contacts in Social Marketing Partnerships (Legarde, Doner et al. 2005)

Legarde, Doner et al.’s (2005) taxonomy uses the three characteristics namely goal convergence, trust and formal contacts to distinguish between the different types of partner evident in the social marketing relationship. This classification aids in partnership selection processes as organisations within the same sector are thought to have similar goals and motivations; equated to the sharing of values leading to good strategic fit. This level of understanding also assists in the management of expectations as similar organisations also have similar levels of commitment to goals.

7.2.3.4 Taxonomy Four: Multi–Relationship Model of Social Marketing (Hastings 2003; Hastings 2007)

The final taxonomy, represents a paradigm shift within social marketing partnership thought. Through the different layers of partnerships working in synergy, this taxonomy emphasises the need to maintain long term relationships. The literature suggests that as problems become more interrelated there is a greater need for synergies across and between sectors. This approach moves the focus beyond behavioural change in isolation to encompass relationship building which remains a complex process. This taxonomy differs from the others in that it interprets social marketing from a holistic perspective, not as isolated exchanges.
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As with the social marketing partnership definitions previously discussed all four taxonomies had commonalities related to the key characteristics of social marketing partnerships. These common characteristics are shown in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Social Marketing Partnership Taxonomy Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared interest/Values</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of resources (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreement</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the social marketing issue</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise Partners</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 identifies that as with the commonalities within the social marketing partnership definition, the characteristics such as shared values and mutual benefit between parties are reinforced. Commitment and the need for a formal contract to govern the relationship are also suggested as important. The researcher believes that...
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as all these taxonomies were transferred and discussed within the social marketing campaign, their association with social marketing issues is implicit.

Secondary Objective 4: To determine the key antecedent variables impacting on social marketing partnerships.

Through phases one and two of this research the key antecedents of social marketing partnerships were identified as mutual benefit, shared values and communication. The operationalised definitions of these constructs developed within this research are illustrated in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Construct Characteristics of Social Marketing Partnership Antecedent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Benefit</td>
<td>Tangible and intangible benefits incurred for participating in the partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Values</td>
<td>Where shared values exist, organisational values are thought to be similar leading to partners adopt the same perspective of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Two-way process incorporating formality, frequency and quality of communications between parties within the partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these antecedents were mediated by relationship commitment and/or trust. Mutual benefit was predicted to have a positive association to commitment as, the benefits incurred during the partnership would motivate the participant to commit to in the long and short term. Shared values were positively mediated by both trust and commitment. As the definition of shared values suggests, partners share similar goals and values related to how the problem is defined. Due to this similar nature, between those in the exchange sharing values are thought to be committed and trusting. Finally, communication refers to the two-way dialogue process and is
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positively associated with trust. Communication was associated with trust as through an open dialogue process, across and between levels, expectations can be managed through the allocation of roles and responsibilities.

**Secondary Objective 5:** To establish the key outcome variables of social marketing partnerships.

Three outcomes of trust and commitment as mediating variables were also identified, including expectation of continuance, cooperation and tension. The operational definitions of these outcome constructs are provided in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4 Construct Definition of Social Marketing Partnership Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of continuance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood of switching between problems or causes and the future development of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolised through the sharing of tangible and intangible resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manifestation of negative outcomes in the relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectation of continuance replaced motivation as an outcome of relationship commitment. As the focus of social marketing partnerships move from the short to long term endeavours the higher the level of commitment the lower the likelihood of the partner terminating the partnership or switching between causes. When relationship commitment and trust were present, cooperative relationships manifested. This cooperation materialised in many forms however was associated with the sharing of tangible and intangible resources. Tension was shown to be negatively associated with trust. When a low level of trust existed, tension would increase which could further corrode the relationship.
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7.2.2 Primary Research Objective

The primary objective of this research was to develop a social marketing partnership framework through the extension of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable (KMV) model (Figure 1.4) within the social marketing domain.

Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) Key Mediating Variable model is one of the best known and most cited theories in the relationship marketing literature. Relationship marketing has been advocated as a relevant theory to guide the development of partnerships into the social marketing domain. This relational perspective moves the focus within social marketing from short term transactions evident in the period of coordination to longer term sustainable change advocated during the period of integrated systems. A relational perspective therefore has the potential to penetrate both vertical and horizontal levels (see Figure 1.3).

Like their commercial relationship marketing counterparts, social marketers also position relationship commitment and trust at the centre of their activities as the presence of these constructs act as precursors or mediating variables for long term cooperation. Within the social marketing context trust was shown to relate to the reliability and predictability of the partner. When the level of trust diminished within the relationship, for instance a partner was perceived to be unreliable; the level of commitment to the partnership was also questioned. Therefore, trust is also thought to be mediated through relationship commitment.

As social change endeavours are longitudinal in nature, the commitment or willingness to continue to participate in the relationship in the long term is important, particularly due to the non-monetary motivations of social marketers.

Figure 7.1 presents the Social Marketing Partnership Framework. This framework positions relationship commitment and trust as central to social marketing partnership relationships. However, arising from the empirical testing of the model two direct relationships which were not predicted as an outcome of the literature or case study manifested.
Chapter Seven: Conclusions and Implications

The first relationship identified was the direct path between shared values and cooperation. Revisiting the operational definition of shared values, it suggests that partners can share common values in relation to the change endeavour and organisational objectives. The case study showed that organisations who were similar had a pre-existing level of trust than those whose values did not converge. Within relationships with low levels of shared values a longer period of time was needed to build the trusting relationship and cooperate fully. For these reasons, in some instances trust does not need to act as a mediating variable and therefore can be directly related to cooperation.

Figure 7.1 Social Marketing Partnership Framework

![Diagram of Social Marketing Partnership Framework](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB = Mutual Benefits</th>
<th>SV = Shared Values</th>
<th>Com = Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC = Relationship Commitment</td>
<td>Tr = Trust</td>
<td>Coop = Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot = Expectation of Continuance</td>
<td>Ten = Tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second direct relationship is communication and cooperation. One of the dominant facets of communication, communication of expectations, was identified to have a direct relationship with cooperation. Within the case study in particular, the management of these expectations had a direct relationship with trust. However,
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when in a relationship where trust is already present and the roles and expectations are effectively communicated cooperative activities manifest.

The primary objective of this research was to develop and test a social marketing partnership framework through the extension of Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) model, therefore it was concerned with theory building as opposed to verification. As an outcome of this theory building process a number of recommendations can be made to further enhance the conceptualisation of social marketing partnerships.

7.4 Areas of Future Research

The validity of this social marketing partnership framework can be further extended through additional empirical testing with a larger sample size. This research could also benefit from testing the social marketing partnership framework in different contexts, most notably within developed and under-developing economies. The majority of the literature discussed during phase-one of this research arose from social marketing activities within the developed world. Similarly, the case study undertaken within the island of Ireland (IOI) defined the key social marketing constructs within a developed world context. Although both developed and developing countries are tasked with overcoming wicked issues, the type of issues that social marketers face differ within these contexts, as does how problems are framed and the infrastructures available to facilitate change. Therefore, further research could be undertaken to identify whether the social marketing partnership framework arising from this research is applicable and hence valid within under-developing economies.

This research incorporated both longitudinal (case study) and cross sectional (SEM analysis) elements. The case study identified that the partnership evolved over time, which meant that at different points during the development of the partnership there were variations in the presence of the key social marketing partnership constructs. As part of this research a cross sectional design was undertaken to test the validity of key the social marketing partnership constructs. This social marketing framework could be further validated by testing it as part of a longitudinal study. This type of research approach could test the existence of the key social marketing partnerships
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constructs at different points in time. This conceptualisation would assist in guiding practitioners on how to initiate and sustain partnerships over time.

As a result of empirically testing the proposed social marketing partnership model, the importance of three constructs; shared value, cooperation and communication of expectations, which were not previously hypothesised were identified. Further research should be undertaken to specifically comprehend the role of these constructs throughout the development of social marketing partnerships, particularly as they become more intersetorial in nature. For example, the adoption of an insectorial approach will intensify the different modes of communication needed to develop successful partnerships. The case study identified the necessity to manage communications between the partnership as well as across partners within organisations (for example the service station staff). Both levels of communication had the power to facilitate of inhibit partnership working. As social marketers continue to move towards transformational partnerships, the need for communication across and between levels of the partnership will intensify. The emergence of the dominant role of communication suggests that further research is needed into the role of network theory and how networking models can further enhance the development of partnerships within the social marketing domain. Relationship marketing and network marketing have similar characteristics and therefore the social marketing domain could benefit from adopting learning’s from both in the future.

It was outside the boundaries of this research to discuss specific types of partnerships. However, the continued proliferation of public-private partnerships within the social marketing domain suggests the need for multidisciplinary research in the area of social marketing. This implies that social marketers must continue to redevelop their skills to ensure the feasibility and ease of adopting an interdisciplinary approach to change endeavours, for example, the central tenets and language adopted within health promotion.

This social marketing partnership framework suggests that further research is needed into the implications the transformational approach to change has on policy development and implementation. This research emphasised the need to address issue framing from a sustainability perspective as opposed to the traditional one-
dimensional, hierarchal approach to change. Transformational social marketing partnerships are developed within open systems which invite feedback loops to facilitate the integration of all layers contributing to a dynamic iterative process of expanded networks and stakeholders. The ability to feedback within and throughout the system ensures the co-learning in parallel to evolving societal issues, as opposed to adopting a reactionary approach.

Finally, the reflective and formative measurement scales used within this research were adapted from previously validated item scales within the wider marketing literature. They should endure further testing within the social marketing context. In particular, the items that were incorporated within the tension and cooperation item scales were derived from the literature and case study analysis and therefore should be tested to insure all relevant items are present.
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Appendix A: Get Your Life into Gear Formative Research Overview

*Research conducted by Millward Brown Landsdown July 2009*

**Research Aim:**
To explore the current knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of truck drivers in relation to their health, and general attitudes towards the implementation of a workplace lifestyle programme potentially targeting weight loss/maintenance.

**Research Objectives:**
- To gain an in-depth understanding of the current lifestyles, attitudes and behaviours of truck drivers and to identify key needs and areas of concern in relation to their general health & well-being.
- To investigate levels of interest among truck drivers in a workplace-facilitated health & lifestyle programme, with a view to:
  - Determining the feasibility of such a programme
  - Understanding its likely impact on current attitudes & behaviours
  - Identifying the key drivers of success
  - Identifying potential barriers to success

**Research Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 In-depth interviews</td>
<td>Depot of the pilot company in Belfast</td>
<td>Drivers were interviewed intermittently throughout their working day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Focus groups</td>
<td>Belfast (2 groups); Dublin (2 groups); Cork (1 group); Sligo (1 group)</td>
<td>Free-find basis according to criteria: Male, different levels of driving experience, mix of ages, drive 20hrs per week, direct employees &amp; short haul drivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Findings:**
- Drivers felt it was difficult to live a healthy lifestyle in their current occupation.
- Many (particularly some of the older drivers) claimed to have made some positive changes to their diets and how they eat in recent times mainly as a result of either doctor’s advice or in response to weight gain.
- Claimed that it was considerably more difficult for them to control their diets and what they ate because of unpredictability of composition of work shift; lack of services available; slow metabolism/difficulties with digestion due to night shift work and fatigue
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- Drivers were almost using their profession as an excuse not to be “healthy” feeling that the nature of their work did not allow them to lead a healthy lifestyle.
- Drivers who had made the choice to “become more healthy” in recent years had proved that it can be done successfully and felt that their wisdom had come with age, experience and in some cases from a health scare that had happened either to themselves or to a close friend/family member.
- Boredom, fatigue and lack of adequate services on the IOI were major negatives of their occupation and this fed into their perceptions of, attitudes towards and relationship with food.
- Some of the barriers to healthy eating for drivers were: Lack of education, lack of services, convenience and cost.
- The majority of drivers who were either living with a partner/wife, felt strongly influenced by their behaviours and in fact claimed that they (their partners/wives) were encouraging them to eat more healthily.
- Eating patterns tended to be quite sporadic in nature and many were unsure as to when they were going to get an opportunity to stop and take their breaks and as a consequence tended to fill up on un-healthy or sugar fuelled snacks in the interim.
- Most (that consumed the unhealthy snacks) were aware that the snacks they were consuming were not good for them but cited convenience, boredom, seeking energy from “sugar rush”, comfort eating or a “sweet tooth” as the main reasons for this behaviour.
- Drivers need to see and experience tangible benefits from weight loss attempts and need constant motivation (either from themselves/others) until it becomes a part of their lives.
- Many drivers were using their profession as an excuse not to be “healthy” as they felt that the nature of their work did not allow them to lead a healthy lifestyle.
- Education around positive changes that can be made should be a key part of the programme as many drivers almost feel that their occupation does not allow them to be healthy.
- Realising the extent to which they can implement positive changes is and making drivers realise that healthy lifestyles are possible is the first step in the process and the initial barrier which needs to be overcome.
- Education around healthy eating, food for energy and how small changes can affect their lives positively is of paramount importance for these drivers.
- Many of them are eating the wrong foods (increasing levels of fatigue) for the wrong reasons (boredom, combating monotony) and have thus developed an unhealthy relationship and attitude towards what they feel they should be consuming either for energy purposes or to adhere to the “stereotypical” image of a truck driver.
Appendix B: An Example of an External Advisory Group Meeting Agenda

Agenda:
Men’s Health Initiative External Steering Group Meeting

---

**Date**  
Wednesday 3rd December, 2008

**Venue**  
Boardroom, *safefood* Dublin Office

**Time**  
10.30 – 1pm

---

1. Welcome and introductions

2. Presentations:
   - Rationale and background to the project, Sinead Duane and Marita Hennessy, *safefood*
   - Experience of engaging with road hauliers, Finian Murray, HSE

3. Discussion:
   - Issues arising from the presentations
   - Generation of ideas/sharing of experiences
   - Project progression
   - Role of steering group/mode of communication

4. AOB
Appendix C: SWOT and PESTEL Analysis

SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats)

Strengths:
- This all-island initiative aims to tackle overweight and obesity among men in the workplace. This activity has been recommended in a number of reports and strategies on IOI.
- Workplace can provide peer support for weight loss/maintenance activities.
- Initiatives such as ‘Gut Busters’ in ROI received media attention and support.
- Takes a social marketing approach in which needs assessment is pivotal to the success of the initiative and exchange theory is fundamental thus the initiative will be based on the men’s stated needs.
- Work with employers to improve the weight status of their employees with additional benefits such as improved health and productivity.

Weaknesses
- Does not cater for men who are not in employment.
- Strategies to engage with men about their weight in the workplace have not been tried and tested, therefore evidence is lacking to support the development of the initiative.
- Despite being around since the 70s, social marketing is still a relatively new concept and is still developing.
- May target ‘health conscious’ employees who always are interested and get involved and may not reach those who are most at risk.
- What about females in the workplace and those who don’t need to lose weight (if focus is weight loss)?

Opportunities
- Work with NGOs who are currently involved within this setting and this target group.
- Work with established men’s health networks on the island – Men’s Health Forum.
- Pilot study for future template of long-term initiative.
- This programme could be adapted for use with men in other workplaces.
- Workplace programmes that incorporate healthy eating and physical activity have shown to be effective in the short-term but further studies are needed to prove long-term effectiveness.

Threats
- Competition for advertising in terms of choices/behaviours that support unhealthy weight, e.g. alcohol, unhealthy food choices, sedentary behaviours.
- Lack of support structures in the workplaces, e.g. lack of employer buy-in. Sustainability of any initiative.
- Short-term imitative in terms of changing behaviours will not work on a long-term basis.
- Focus on socioeconomically disadvantaged men may pose a threat to any initiative as the industries they are employed in have a high turnover.
- Current economic climate. Job instability and pressure on the industries, thus health of employees may not be a main concern.
- Long working hours in some occupations and some travel long distances for work (e.g. construction).
- Sub-contracted staff.
- Social norms of masculinity.
  - Men are a ‘hard-to-reach’ group
  - Unhealthy weight is ‘acceptable’ for men compared with women.
# PESTEL Analysis

The analysis below takes into consideration all the factors that will affect the success of any initiatives that safefood decide to develop. The aspects included are subject to change depending on our target market/company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PESTEL Analysis Factors</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Island Initiative</td>
<td>Study has to incorporate participants from the North and South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Health Promotion has been recommended by a number of International bodies</td>
<td>1986 Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, Jakarta Declaration on Leading Health Promotion into the 21st century, 2005 Bangkok Charter for Health Promotion in a Globalized World. Europe: Luxembourg Declaration on Workplace Health Promotion in the EU, The Lisbon Statement on Workplace Health in small and medium sized enterprises and the Barcelona Declaration on Developing Good Workplace Practice in Europe. WHO DPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current 'credit crunch' &amp; associated job losses</td>
<td>Need to persuade employers that they will receive something of value in return for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Implementing Initiative</td>
<td>Need company to invest their own money in the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms of Masculinity</td>
<td>Have the potential to affect employees and managements perception of the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers to Change</td>
<td>Need to highlight how change can happen easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Buying Patterns</td>
<td>Consider their employees purchase decisions regarding food and why they make these choices/where they shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>Need to understand how participants interact outside the workplace- so we can implement an initiative that they can adopt in every aspect of their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class of Target Market</td>
<td>Will lead to the formation of certain attitudes: i.e. purchase decisions, education level concerning health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Origins of the workforce and who they interact with will affect their attitude toward initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to doing certain jobs</td>
<td>Stereotypes: e.g. ‘Its ok to be overweight if you are not dealing with the public’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>This will determine the amount of free time that employees will have after work, also factors to consider include: manual versus office jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Attitude</td>
<td>Will determine how the initiative is supported, implemented and sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction in the home environment</td>
<td>What are the structures of family life?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>Employee Attitude toward Company</td>
<td>Are they developing a career versus 'just a job' attitude?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Company may not have the facilities to adopt all changes desired i.e. canteen, gym, healthy vending machine, space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Costs incurred in facilitating changes may be over that allocated to initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Platforms of Communication</td>
<td>Do companies use email, intranet and/or management to communicate, company newsletter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>How do employees get to work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Obesogenic Environment</td>
<td>The number of overweight people in the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation Culture</td>
<td>This will determine the relationship with the workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation Size</td>
<td>Will determine the appropriateness of the interventions suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Turnover Rate</td>
<td>Determine the attitude staff will have to the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
<td>Working relationship could determine the number of individuals who participate (peer approval and support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>Are there already employee assistance programmes or occupational health and safety initiatives in force?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Environment</td>
<td>Will determine who makes purchase decisions, how long they have to travel to work etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td>Debate over the need for weight loss initiative</td>
<td>Some companies may see it as a priority some may not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law</td>
<td>Could determine time off and amount of time allocated to breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry Specific regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Model of Funder Relationships in the Non Profit Sector

Source: Macmillan, Money et al. (2005)
Appendix E: Social Marketing Partnerships Online Survey Before Pretesting

And

Appendix F Final Social Marketing Partnerships Online Survey are found on the attached CD
Appendix G: Email Communication to Survey Recipients

IOI online survey distribution communication

Email 1: Initial Invitation email sent 2nd April 2012

Subject: Need help creating sustainable behavioural change partnerships?

Dear <First Name>,

In the next few days, an investigation into the development of sustainable behavioural change partnerships will be launched across the Republic of Ireland and United Kingdom. As part of this research we will be inviting experts within the field of behavioural change to share their experiences of partnership development via an online survey.

By participating in this valuable and relevant piece of research you will be contributing to the development of a much sought after Reference Guide to Sustainable Behavioural Change Partnerships. You will further benefit from receiving a copy of the key findings from this investigation.

You will receive a link to this research via email and it will take no longer than 18 – 20 minutes to complete.

If you have any questions or comments relating to the survey, I would be happy to answer them via email (s.duane1@nuigalway.ie) or alternatively please contact Dr. Christine Domegan Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway (christine.domegan@nuigalway.ie).

Kindest Regards,
Sinead Duane (Project Coordinator) and

Dr. Christine Domegan,
Senior Lecturer in Marketing,
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics,
National University of Ireland Galway,
Ireland.

Email 2: Questionnaire distributed 4th April 2012 – Sample Email

Subject: Need help creating sustainable behavioural change partnerships?

Dear <First Name>,
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An investigation into the development of sustainable behavioural change partnerships is now underway across the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland. As an expert in the field, we invite you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and contribute your valuable experiences to this relevant PhD study. By participating, you will assist in the development of a much sought after Reference Guide to Sustainable Behavioural Change Partnerships whilst further benefiting from receiving a copy of the key findings from this investigation.

To assist us in capturing your valuable experiences relating to behavioural change partnerships, please click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships

(If the link does not open automatically please copy and paste it into the web address bar).

This online survey will take approximately 15 - 18 minutes to complete and the final results will be aggregated to maintain the confidentiality of all participants. No single person/organisation will be identified at any point throughout this process. The Reference Guide will be available within 2 months from the closing of this survey.

If you have any questions or comments relating to this research, I would be happy to answer them via email (s.duane1@nuigalway.ie) or alternatively please contact Dr. Christine Domegan Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway (Christine.Domegan@nuigalway.ie).

Thank you in advance for contributing to this important study.

Kindest Regards,
Sinead Duane (Project Coordinator) and

Dr. Christine Domegan,
Senior Lecturer in Marketing,
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics,
National University of Ireland Galway

Email 3: Reminder email sent 17th of April 2012

Email 4: Final IOI reminder email sent 10th of May 2012

Georgestown Social Marketing Listserv

Email 1: Email distributed through the Georgestown Social Marketing Listserv sent 1st of May 2012

PHD study investigating Social Marketing Partnerships

Dear List Serve Colleagues,
Appendix G: Email Communication to Survey Recipients

An investigation into the development of Sustainable Social Marketing partnerships is now underway across the **United Kingdom (UK)** and **Republic of Ireland (ROI)** organised through the National University of Ireland, Galway.

As experts in the field, we would like to invite social marketers working in the UK and Ireland to take advantage of this unique opportunity and contribute your valuable experiences to this relevant PhD study. By participating you will assist in the development of a much sought after Reference Guide to Sustainable Social Marketing Partnerships whilst further benefiting from receiving a copy of the key findings from this investigation.

To assist us in capturing your valuable experiences relating to Social Marketing Partnerships please click on the link below. This online survey will take approximately 15 - 18 minutes to complete.

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships)

*(If the link does not open automatically please copy and paste it into the web address bar).*

For information:
* No single person/ organisation at any point throughout this process will be identified.
* The final results will be aggregated to maintain the confidentiality of all participants.
* The Reference Guide will be available within 2 months from the closing of this survey.

If you have any questions or comments relating to this research, I would be happy to answer them via email (s.duane1@nuigalway.ie) or alternatively please contact Dr. Christine Domegan Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway (Christine.Domegan@nuigalway.ie).

Thank you in advance for your valuable contribution to this PhD study.

Kindest Regards,
Sinead Duane (Project Coordinator) and

Dr. Christine Domegan,
Senior Lecturer in Marketing,
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics,
National University of Ireland Galway.

**Email 2:** Email distributed through the Georgestown Social Marketing Listserv sent 11th of May 2012- opening the research to global participants.

**PHD study investigating Social Marketing Partnerships**

Dear List Serve Colleagues,
Appendix G: Email Communication to Survey Recipients

Over the past week I have been overwhelmed by the support and interest I have received from the global community in relation to this PhD research. Therefore I would like to take this opportunity to invite social marketers from around the world who have previously engaged in the development of Social Marketing Partnerships to participate.

Your experiences developing Social Marketing Partnerships are invaluable and central to this study. There's no cost involved, it takes just 15 - 18 minutes of your time! You will directly contribute to a much sought after Reference Guide to Sustainable Behavioural Change Partnerships and you will also benefit by receiving the key findings from this investigation.

To capture your valuable experiences relating to Social Marketing Partnerships please click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships
(If the link does not open automatically please copy and paste it into the web address bar).

For information:
* No single person/ organisation at any point throughout this process will be identified.
* The final results will be aggregated to maintain the confidentiality of all participants.
* The Reference Guide will be available within 2 months from the closing of this survey.

If you have any questions or comments relating to this PhD research, I would be happy to answer them via email (s.duane1@nuigalway.ie) alternatively contact Dr. Christine Domegan Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway (Christine.Domegan@nuigalway.ie).

Thank you in advance for your valuable contribution to this PhD study.

Kindest Regards,
Sinead Duane (Project Coordinator) and
Dr. Christine Domegan,
Senior Lecturer in Marketing,
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics,
National University of Ireland Galway.
Over the past 2 weeks behavioural change experts across the UK and ROI have shared their knowledge and experiences of developing sustainable partnerships for a PhD study organised by Sinead Duane a student from the National University of Ireland Galway (NUIG).

Sinead is looking for UK behaviour change experts with experience of working in partnerships to help with the study. The survey monkey questionnaire would take just 15 - 18 minutes to complete and your answers will directly contribute to a Reference Guide to Sustainable Behavioural Change Partnerships. In addition you will also be sent the key findings from the research.

To take part in the survey please click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/behaviouralchangepartnerships
Appendix G: Email Communication to Survey Recipients

(If the link does not open automatically please copy and paste it into the web address bar).

For information:
* No single person/ organisation at any point throughout this process will be identified.
* The final results will be aggregated to maintain the confidentiality of all participants.
* The Reference Guide will be available within 2 months from the closing of this survey.

If you have any questions or comments relating to this PhD research, please email (s.duane1@nuigalway.ie) alternatively contact Dr. Christine Domegan Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway (Christine.Domegan@nuigalway.ie).

Thank you in advance for contributing to this PhD study.

Kindest Regards,
Sinead Duane (Project Coordinator) and

Dr. Christine Domegan,
Senior Lecturer in Marketing,
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics,
National University of Ireland Galway.

Email 2: Email reminder distributed through the National Social Marketing Centre
e-bulletin sent 10th of May 2012
# Appendix H Factor Scores and Principal Components

## Commitment Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...is something we are very committed to.</td>
<td>1.6481</td>
<td>0.85025</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is very important to our organisation.</td>
<td>1.6852</td>
<td>0.88646</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is of very little significance to us.</td>
<td>3.6595</td>
<td>0.54754</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is something my organisation intends to maintain into the future (eg. over the next 2 years and possibly beyond).</td>
<td>1.9444</td>
<td>1.26516</td>
<td>0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is something my organisation could walk away from tomorrow”.</td>
<td>3.2969</td>
<td>0.74276</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is something my organisation really cares about.</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td>1.09315</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...deserves our organisation's maximum effort to maintain.</td>
<td>2.0741</td>
<td>1.27163</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness of fit test for factor scores: Chi-Square 32.797    df:14    Sig:0.003

## Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our partner is very unpredictable. I never know how they are going to act from one day to the next.</td>
<td>2.3519</td>
<td>1.30539</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can never be sure what our partner is going to surprise us with next.</td>
<td>2.2963</td>
<td>1.19163</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that our partner will be thoroughly dependable, especially when it comes to things that are important to my organisation.</td>
<td>3.4259</td>
<td>.96352</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, the partner will be reliable in the future.</td>
<td>3.4259</td>
<td>.83783</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know that our partner will always be willing to offer my organisation the support it may need.</td>
<td>3.4815</td>
<td>1.16134</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our partner would not let us down, even if they found themselves in an unforeseen situation (e.g. competition from other funders, changes in government policy).</td>
<td>3.3148</td>
<td>1.34338</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Likelihood Extraction Method: 2 Factors extracted  
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalisation  
Goodness of fit test: Chi – square: 12.617     df:4     Sig: 0.13
### Appendix H: Factor Loadings and Composite Scores

#### Mutual Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We both contribute different resources to the relationship that help us achieve our mutual goals.</td>
<td>1.7778</td>
<td>0.81650</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have complementary strengths that are useful to our relationship.</td>
<td>1.7593</td>
<td>0.79941</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We each have separate abilities that when combined together, enable us to achieve goals beyond our individual reach.</td>
<td>1.7963</td>
<td>0.83281</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Likelihood Extraction Method

#### Shared Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, their opinions and values are a lot like ours.</td>
<td>2.2778</td>
<td>1.20403</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We like and respect their values.</td>
<td>2.1296</td>
<td>1.19821</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We share a very similar set of values (e.g. in terms of their beliefs about how to deal with behavioural change problems...).</td>
<td>2.3519</td>
<td>1.24624</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Likelihood Extraction

Df=0

#### Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Comp 1</th>
<th>Comp 2</th>
<th>Comp 3</th>
<th>Comp 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In coordinating our activities with this partner, formal communication channels are followed (i.e. channels are regularized and structured modes versus casual, informal and word-of-mouth modes).</td>
<td>2.4259</td>
<td>0.96352</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The terms of our relationship have been written down in detail.</td>
<td>2.5370</td>
<td>1.00401</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The partners expectations of us are communicated in detail.</td>
<td>2.4444</td>
<td>0.79305</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The terms of our relationship have been explicitly verbalised and discussed.</td>
<td>2.2963</td>
<td>0.92409</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>-0.453</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We inform our partner in advance of changing needs.</td>
<td>2.2037</td>
<td>.83281</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this relationship, it is expected that any</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>0.72684</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>-0.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Information which might help the other party will be provided. | 1.9259 | 0.74863 | 0.578 | 0.003 | 0.016 | -0.698 |
| The parties are expected to keep each other informed about events or changes that may affect the other party. | 3.0370 | 0.93087 | 0.165 | 0.433 | 0.694 | -0.041 |
| It is expected that the parties will only provide information according to prespecified agreements. | 3.2593 | 0.75698 | -0.107 | 0.667 | 0.376 | -0.066 |
| We do not volunteer much information regarding our activities to our partner. | 2.5556 | 1.20794 | 0.688 | -0.123 | -0.180 | -0.079 |
| This partner keeps us fully informed about issues that affect our activities. | 1.9630 | 0.91038 | 0.674 | -0.384 | 0.204 | 0.151 |
| Our advice and counsel is sought by this partner. | 1.9815 | 0.68655 | 0.547 | -0.389 | -0.240 | 0.066 |
| We participate in goal setting with this partner. | 2.2778 | 0.97935 | 0.405 | -0.298 | 0.487 | 0.399 |
| We help the partner in its planning activities. | 2.2963 | 1.28312 | 0.727 | -0.171 | -0.323 | 0.171 |

Extraction method: Principal components

### Tension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tension 1</th>
<th>Tension 2</th>
<th>Tension 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of the partnership</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of funding</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic direction</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of the partnership</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - monetary resource allocation</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on actions</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of actions</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>-0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How goals and direction can be achieved</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in parallel as opposed to in partnership</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for the partnership</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power balance within the partnership</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... is good at solving disputes before they come up</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>create problems in our working relationship.</td>
<td>3.4074</td>
<td>1.09059</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... makes sure that problems do not arise in our working</td>
<td>3.5370</td>
<td>0.92579</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... has the ability to openly discuss solutions when problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction method: Principal Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectations of continuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our organisation and our partner are very committed to each</td>
<td>2.3962</td>
<td>1.29109</td>
<td>-.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If our organisation could find another partner in this country,</td>
<td>3.3396</td>
<td>0.87582</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are likely to switch to a new partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a high level of uncertainty in this partnership.</td>
<td>3.2642</td>
<td>0.96379</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We and our partner organisation are not sure how long our</td>
<td>3.1698</td>
<td>1.17237</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship will last.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction: Maximum Likelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of fit test: Chi – square: 0.387  df 2  Sig 0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrix(a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of information</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared learning</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altering activities for a common purpose</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent messaging</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of operations</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing aims and objectives</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing outcomes</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Factor Loadings and Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and outputs</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Composite Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting time frame for strategy development</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting time frame for strategy development</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning realistic measures</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhering to processes</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating to all staff involved</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating to other stakeholders</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacting to changing circumstances</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of activities</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.*

*a. 4 components extracted.*
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