Partnership, Power and Policy in Social Marketing: Reflections and Conceptions from Pakistan

Dr. Mir Sadaat Baloch[1]

Abstract

Social business has to do with the elimination of poverty and enhancement of human welfare – and a priority therefore for practical policy in the area of social business must be to discovery means to tackle imbalances in health and social care in a poor population poorly served with social infrastructure such as Pakistan. Currently policy in this arena is promoting partnership. Yet we wish to discuss a pertinent problem inherent in this focus. The developing world considers partnership as the new façade of power, whereas the developed world mandates it as a way to empower the powerless. The discrepancy between the two parts of world makes it fundamental to address the issue of power in partnerships. We conclude that the issue can be addressed by developing an 'upstream' approach to social marketing. We plan to use such a framework to examine empirically power relationships in partnerships in Pakistan.

Introduction

Practical welfare policy in the area of social business is currently being addressed in Pakistan through developed and developing country partnership to address inequalities in health and social care. Currently policy in this arena is promoting partnership without really surfacing assumptions behind the policy and behind the word and practice 'partnership'. So we wish to discuss a pertinent problem inherent in this focus. The developing world considers partnership as the new façade of power, whereas the developed world mandates it as a way to empower the powerless. The discrepancy between the two parts of world makes it fundamental to address the issue of power in partnerships.

We discuss function of social marketing in this arena. Question arises how we can study power in a social marketing partnership? If social marketing partnerships are seen as a solution to provide greater human welfare in

---

[1] University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Pakistan this discrepancy deserves attention by social marketers in this arena. In reflecting on this we have seen that power is under-theorised and overlooked in practice. We address this by reflecting and conceptualising this issue of partnership, power and policy.

In order to scrutinise the claim that partnerships are driven by power not by the process of partnership, it is fundamental to examine the concept of power in partnership. The developing world considers partnership as an opportunity to exercise unequal power, whereas the developed world sees it as a way to empower the powerless. The discrepancy between the two parts of world makes it fundamental to address the issue of power in partnerships. The question arises how we can study power in a social marketing partnership?

There is a positive notion attached to partnership (Gregory, 2005), and on the other hand negative notion is attached to power (Bentz et al., 2005). Hence, it is difficult to explain why partnership can be effective when power differences are inherited in it (Ellersiek and Kenis, 2007).

Social Marketing Explained

The conception of social marketing as a theoretical term is not clear, Helmig and Thaler (2010) claim that sociologists focused on the term in 1950s, whereas, MacFadyen et al. (2003) point out that a differentiated field of marketing emerged after Kotler (1969) and Kotler and Zaltman (1971) started a debate to broaden the concept of marketing. However, utilisation of marketing concepts in social ideas is traceable to family planning programmes taking place in the United States in the 1960s (Andreasen, 2002a) and is therefore clearly pertinent to health and social welfare programmes in Pakistan today. There is a lack of definitional clarity about the concept, which has created confusion within the field of marketing and outside the discipline as well (Alves, 2010).

Social marketing professionals have emphasised that what differentiates social marketing from these concepts is its stress on voluntary behaviour change Andreasen (2002a) and the aim is welfare of individual instead of the organisation (Donovan, 2011). Andreasen (2002b) asserts that the social marketers have to expand their focus beyond products associated with behaviour change, but did not explain how this focus can be shifted. Hastings (2003) imparts the notion of relation in the subject and claims that relational thinking is not a tool but it is fundamental to social marketing. He identifies all the possible relational aspects in social marketing and develops a multi-relationship model of social marketing, which is an effective tool to analyse relationships. So the social element is clear: this has to be done with rather than done to. Although power is not referred to, this is clearly an issue of

power. A further extension to the concept of social marketing was made by Stead et al. (2007) focussing on its effectiveness in behaviour change management. They claim that social marketing is also effective in upstream activity, whereas, the usual criteria used to judge the effectiveness of a campaign only has four Ps (Product, Place, Price, Promotion). They develop the mnemonic of three further Ps: Policy, People, and Partnership, to express what upstream means. We understand that the way forward for social marketing is to expand the scope from downstream programmes to upstream interventions using these 3Ps of social marketing.

What is Partnership?

Stern and Green (2005) define partnership as a preceding environment for the activities downstream. They refer to it as something that exhibits traits such as mutual trust, high level of commitment, equivalent proprietorship and strive for a common goal. Lister (1999) indicates that partnership is a process where 'mutual support, mutual trust, reciprocal accountability, joint decision making, long-term commitment and financial transparency happen. It is also explained as the vibrant collection of units across different segments that can endeavour to deliver people with 'public good', such as clean air, clean water, education and health care, (Seitanidi, 2010). What each of these approaches to partnership has in common is an unarticulated assumption that there is no imbalance as each partner enjoys equal rights and responsibility and they equally help one another to accomplish a collective goal. This coheres with the developed world's understanding of partnership with the developing world in welfare programmes.

But other researchers, such as Crawford (2003) writing from the developing world's perspective, in this case from Indonesia, assert otherwise that power differentials tend to emerge in the process of partnership. Currently the mainstream conceptualisation defines the term partnership whilst ignoring the aspect of power differentials.

Why Partnerships?

Here we discuss and reflect upon current thinking and writing on partnerships for social welfare. It can make it probable to adapt development ventures to indigenous desires and interests, thus leveraging the expansion proficiency and capitals of foreigners. Extensive capability building improves the capacity of partners to produce and grow their services - while dropping expenses and rising validity with indigenous governments(Lister, 1999)

This implies that partnership can make it possible for a resource incompetent local government to leverage on the resources and expertise of outsider that ultimately results in cost reduction. This implication raises three issues: first before engaging in a partnership one party has less power in terms of resources or expertise, secondly, why would one party allows the other party to leverage on its resource and, finally a partnership is not a guarantee for cost reduction unless it turns out successfully.   These three implications are what we want to encourage reflection upon. Many years ago Elliott (1987) argued that claims might be made for transparency or mutuality of a partnership but that there is an asymmetry of power that is hard to be removed through discourse – by mere words, perhaps he meant. When there is an asymmetry of power then the powerful can use the partnership to advance its objectives and can also limit the leverage of resource usage.

This is surely an issue of disparity of power leading to a less legitimacy locally. Yet Lister also comments that the powerful might in promote their own institutional survival and that such action would make it hard to reach the common objectives on which the partnership is created (Lister, 1999). Why is this not developed? We instead have a history to draw upon where power remains hidden and partnership, as one practical outcome of continuing concern to develop Pakistani welfare more widely, continues to be practised in an atmosphere of Western optimism. When the orientation of partnership turns to institutional survival and advancing of organisational objectives rather than common objective achievement then partnership is surely deemed to be ineffective in longer run. Dowling et al (2004) suggest that the success of a partnership should be judged not on its completion but how much change it will bring after its completion.

Yet again from a developed world perspective, Stern and Green (2005) assert that each partner has a different incentive to engage in a partnership, a community takes part to become part of decision-making process, with the public sector there to act as gatekeeper. And in this setting communities may be taken in as partners but they are expected to accept the existing rules and structures and they become part of the whole process but their impact may be negligible (Lister, 1999). This clearly indicates the presence of power, and a tacit acknowledgement of its presence, even, but there is no problematisation of the issue of power; it is not addressed. Each partner is understood to enter into a partnership with a different motivation and during the process they mainly focus to accomplish their objectives. And yet this is the very thing that propagates uneven power relations. This has even been seen as organisational culture and therefore somehow given. Through the use of

procedures and language power is exercised by power holders are unaware of their ways because it's embedded in their organisational culture (Hodge and Greve, 2007).

The issue of why partners engage in partnership and why they are created is addressed in research but how these partnerships are shaped through power dynamics is unexplored. As we have seen the presence of power may be identified and unequal power relations are often mentioned; but it is not an issue. The question as to how these power relations are developed is missing. As is, therefore, any attempt to provide an answer. Partnerships that exist in developing counties not only involve these two partners private and public sector interests but there is third partner called the international development agencies (IDAs) (Lefebvre, 2011). Nowhere have we seen any reflection upon how the concept of partnership is viewed and practised differently in the developing world from in the developed. Nor have we seen serious concerns raised about the resulting Private-Public Partnerships (PPPs).

Partnership - the latest façade of power?

Yet PPPs have become more powerful and the developing world has noticed. Now, in the environment of developing world's wide socioeconomic gaps and decentralizing states, when regimes fails to deliverer, then PPPs are allowed to function as the "Trojan Horses" of progress (Miraftab, 2004). Private sector organisations contact native regimes and their needy societies with the significance of power sharing, but once the development is in motion the interests of the public are often overcome most powerful member of the partnership—the private sector firms (Miraftab, 2004:89).

Partnerships formed are seen as flawed from the beginning and as being driven by power not by the process of partnership. We reflect that in fact, in order to understand the process of partnership it is necessary to examine the power relations that emerge in partnership. The focus must be on the process of developing power and the relations that are thus created.

Crawford (2003), still from the Indonesian perspective, sees this practice of partnership in developing countries as the means through which IDAs intervene in the domestic reform processes to perplex power asymmetry. He terms this "the latest facade of power". Partnerships in practice operate to the first world's agenda and are used as an instrument to penetrate more effectively into a county's development path and choices, and may very effectively side-line opposition. He considers that the role that partnership processes play, therefore, can be seen as a 'mystification of power

asymmetry' (Crawford 2003:142). We reflect that this is why there is a lack of confidence for the process of partnership in the developing world and instead of viewing it as an effective tool for management it is viewed as a manipulative tool for management.

A key reason for this mistrust about the partnership may well be that the local partners are not often given an equal chance in decision-making process. This in turn generates demotivation in the local partners and ends the sense of ownership for them. Importantly, secondly, the concept of partnership may be seen a foreign idea to locals. In a worst-case scenario this can be life threatening. Indeed it recently has been. We take the example of the polio campaign in Pakistan. In December last year eight health workers of the polio campaign were killed in 48hours, out of eight dead six were females, and a radical group has taken the responsibility of killings (Ahmad, 2012) . The reason they killed those workers is that they were working against their interest. The government while creating partnership has not taken into account the power of such groups, and today the campaign faces serious jeopardies in Pakistan.

Why study power in partnership?
As we have already noted, in recent times there has been a progression in the amount, size and scope of partnerships in private and public sectors. There has been considerable research on the issue of partnership. Yet power which is central issue in partnership, is extremely rarely tackled (Ellersiek and Kenis, 2007). In the literature of partnership, power is no issue because partnering is reflected as a 'win-win' for all those involved (Ellersiek and Kenis, 2007). Perhaps another explanation of this is that power differentials are seen as insuperable hence researchers rule out any form of understanding it in partnerships (Miraftab, 2004). This means the issue of power in partnership still needs to be addressed.

Is partnership to do with 'win-win'? How can the powerless be enabled within the prevailing societal mandate minus any damaging effect to the powerful (Ellersiek and Kenis, 2007). This zero sum conception of power resonates with the conception of Foucault (1982) where a society lives in harmony on defined rules, however such effects are not possible in a conflictual society like Pakistan. We argue therefore that the issue of power is naturally present in the concept of power and managing the power difference is a challenge for partnership management and without addressing the subject of power any partnership will remain symbolic rather than real (Mutch, 2011, Jensen and Sandström, 2011, Seitanidi, 2010, Clegg and Haugaard, 2009).

Conclusion
If the issue of power is addressed and to some extent understood it will certainly make the management of partnership more realistic. There is a positive notion attached to partnership (Gregory, 2005), and on the other hand negative notion is attached to power (Bentz et al., 2005). Hence, there is an issue here to be uncovered by reflection and conceptualisation. How best can the issue of different perspectives be surfaced? For we have clearly demonstrated that the developing world considers partnership as an opportunity to exercise unequal power, whereas the developed world sees it as a way to empower the powerless. The discrepancy between the two parts of world makes it fundamental to address the issue of power in partnerships.

Future course of action
We consider that if we indeed broaden out social marketing into a more upstream set of concerns, focused on the 3Ps of policy, people and partnership a framework for analysis of power can be developed. We aim to develop a framework that captures how power relations are developed in partnerships. We foresee examining what type of power relations surface in a partnership process in Pakistan and how analysis of those relations can help in nurturing the confidence of the developing world towards partnership.

References.

Ahmad, J. 2012. Three more polio workers shot in Pakistan; eight dead in 48 hours. *Reuters*

Alves, H. 2010. The Who, Where, and When of Social Marketing. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing,* 22**,** 288-311.

Andreasen, A. R. 2002a. Marketing social marketing in the social change marketplace. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing***,** 3-13.

Andreasen, A. R. 2002b. Marketing Social Marketing in the Social Change Marketplace. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing,* 21**,** 3-13.

Bentz, J. W., Dorfman, L., Denniston, R. & Novelli, W. 2005. Opportunities for Social Change through Upstream Partnerships. *Social Marketing Quarterly,* 11**,** 17-25.

Clegg, S. R. & Haugaard, M. (eds.) 2009. *The Sage handbook of power*: SAGE Publications Limited.

Crawford, G. 2003. Partnership or power? Deconstructing the'partnership for governance reform'in Indonesia. *Third World Quarterly,* 24**,** 139-159.

Donovan, R. J. 2011. The role of marketing in public health programs

. *Australian Review of Public Affairs* 10**,** 18.

Ellersiek, A. & Kenis, P. Power in Cross-Sector Partnerships: An Analytical Framework and Literature Review. Colloquium on Corporate Political Activity, Paris, 2007.

Elliott, C. 1987. Some aspects of relations between the North and South in the NGO sector. *World Development,* 15**,** 57-68.

Foucault, M. 1982. The subject and power. *Critical inquiry***,** 777-795.

Gregory, R. N. 2005. Stretching the limits of social marketing partnerships, upstream and downstream: Setting the context for the 10th Innovations in Social Marketing Conference. *Social Marketing Quarterly,* 11**,** 9-15.

Hastings, G. 2003. Relational paradigms in social marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing,* 23**,** 6-15.

Helmig, B. & Thaler, J. 2010. On the Effectiveness of Social Marketing—What Do We Really Know? *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing,* 22**,** 264-287.

Hodge, G. A. & Greve, C. 2007. Public–private partnerships: an international performance review. *Public Administration Review,* 67**,** 545-558.

Jensen, T. & Sandström, J. 2011. Stakeholder theory and globalization: The challenges of power and responsibility. *Organization Studies,* 32**,** 473-488.

Kotler, P. & Zaltman, G. 1971. Social marketing: an approach to planned social change. *The Journal of Marketing***,** 3-12.

Kotler, P. L., S. J. 1969. Broadening the Concept of Marketing *The Journal of Marketing* 33**,** 6.

Lefebvre, R. C. 2011. An integrative model for social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing,* 1**,** 54-72.

Lister, S. 1999. Power in partnership?: an analysis of an NGO's relationships with its partners.

MacFadyen, L., Stead, M. & Hastings, G. B. 2003. Social marketing. *The Marketing Book, 5th edn. Butterworth Heinemann: Oxford***,** 694-725.

Miraftab, F. 2004. Public-Private Partnerships The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development? *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 24**,** 89-101.

Mutch, N. E. 2011. *Does Power Imbalance Matter in Corporate-Nonprofit Partnerships?* , University of Otago.

Seitanidi, M. M. 2010. *The politics of partnerships: a critical examination of nonprofit-business partnerships*, Springer.

Stead, M., Gordon, R., Angus, K. & McDermott, L. 2007. A systematic review of social marketing effectiveness. *Health Education,* 107**,** 126-191.

Stern, R. & Green, J. 2005. Boundary workers and the management of frustration: a case study of two Healthy City partnerships. *Health Promot Int,* 20**,** 269-276.

ANNEXURE

Tables of the Article Prevalence of Psychological Distress: Gender Differences among University and College Students and Teachers
By: Arooj Zahid & Syed Azizuddin Agha Pp235-241

Tables

Table1. Demographic description of the sample ($N = 170$)

Variable *Characteristic*		*Frequency*	*(%)*
Age			
	18-28	143	84.1
	29-39	12	7.1
	40-50	11	6.5
	51-61	04	2.4
Gender	Male	74	43.5
	Female	96	56.5
Mother Language			
	Pashto	60	35.3
	Balochi	41	24.1
	Persian	39	22.9
	Others	30	17.6
Family system			
	Nuclear	69	40.6
	Joint	101	59.4
Marital Status			
	Married	31	18.2
	Unmarried	139	81.8
Status			
	Teacher	40	23.5
	Student	130	76.5
Institute	University of Balochistan	54	31.8
	Musa College	27	15.9
	Girls College Cantt	89	52.4

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the sample ($N = 170$)

Variable	M	SD	$Skew$	$Kurt$	α
KPDS	22.88	8.40	.69	.25	.89

Note. KPDS= Kessler Psychological Distress Scale

Table 3. Mean differences in sample on study variables by gender ($N = 170$)

Variable	Male (n =74)		Female (n = 96)		t	P	CI		Chen`s d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
KPDS	21.94	7.75	23.61	8.83	-1.30	.193	-4.19	.85	-0.20

Note. KPDS= Kessler Psychological Distress Scale. *p>.05