Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Up, up and away: social marketing breaks free

Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

oro.open.ac.uk

Up, up and away: Social marketing breaks free

Sally Dibb

Professor in Marketing
Open University
Open University Business School
Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA
UK
Email: Sally.Dibb@open.ac.uk
+44 (0)1908 652787

Abstract

The social marketing literature has been dominated by questions about the field's legitimacy along with the ethical and other implications of its relationship with commercial marketing. In reviewing social marketing's origins and considering its future, this paper acknowledges then moves beyond these concerns; enabling a focus on the opportunities created for this vibrant field in the current environment. Three thematic areas frame the paper's discussion: the legitimacy of social marketing as a field in its own right; the broadening and deepening of the field and the consequences for social change; and the strengths and opportunities arising out of social marketing's relationship with mainstream marketing. The paper reviews social marketing's origins, before considering how the field might draw on the turbulent environment and the dynamic developments taking place within marketing to shape its future.

Key words

Social marketing, behaviour change, nudge, stakeholder management, marketing strategy

Introduction

The origins of social marketing can be traced to Philip Kotler and Sidney Levy, after they became interested in Wiebe's famous question (1951-52) "*Why can't you sell Brotherhood like you sell soap?*". In a seminal article that explored the broadening of marketing beyond its commercial roots, Kotler and Levy (1969) proposed applications to the marketing of cities and locations, health-related and other causes, and even to people. Through this broadening in scope, marketing was able to become '*more socially relevant*' (Andreasen, 1994:109). Reflecting this move, Kotler and Zaltman (1971) adopted the term 'social marketing' to encapsulate marketing practices in pursuit of social rather than monetary gain (Kotler, 2013).

Over the intervening forty years, researchers have sought to define social marketing: they have questioned what the field is and is not; have pondered the contexts in which it can be applied; compared and contrasted it with other behaviour changes approaches, and have reflected on its relationship with the marketing mainstream. While such issues have played a central role in shaping social marketing's development, the field has for too long been shackled by questions about its legitimacy and by a preoccupation with its relationship with commercial marketing. The moment has been reached to shed these restraints, to acknowledge that social marketing is both a legitimate and vibrant field, and to consider its future.

Three overarching themes provide a springboard for exploring the current state of social marketing (Dibb & Carrigan, 2013). The first theme focuses on the legitimacy of social marketing in its own right, reflecting calls for social marketing to be positioned as part of the marketing mainstream, rather than as a "curiosity" or "special case" (p.1377). The second, concerns the continuing broadening and deepening of social marketing applications (Gordon, 2013a). The third theme focuses on the complex relationship between social marketing and mainstream marketing and the challenges associated therein (Hastings, 2007). This theme in particular has been subject to recent scrutiny from authors asking searching questions and calling the corporate world to account for its role in the global economic meltdown (e.g. Hastings, 2012; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). The complexity of the relationship between social marketing and commercial marketing, which has underpinned the development of the field, is aptly captured by Hastings (2013:1390), who sees social marketing as, "*...being undermined because the very word 'marketing' has become synonymous with sharp practice and deceit*". These sentiments imply that in order to transcend questions about social's marketing's legitimacy, ways must be found to leverage for social ends the many dynamic developments that marketing is witnessing. Although calls for social marketing to distance itself from the negative consequences of commercial marketing will rightly endure (e.g. Hastings & Saren, 2003; Peattie & Peattie, 2003), and questions about the ethical implications will continue (e.g. Gordon, 2011; Spotswood, French, Tapp & Stead, 2010); there is also, in the words of Hastings and Saren (2003a:315), the need to *"broker a way forward"*.

While acknowledging these debates, this paper explores and then accepts the legitimacy of social marketing in its own right; moving beyond questions about whether commercial marketing and social marketing interests can be reconciled. Those interested in further exploring these debates or learning more about the challenging questions facing social marketing can refer to Kotler and Lee (2007), Hastings and Domegan (2014), and to various papers on the topic by Andreasen (1994; 1997; 2002; 2003; 2012); French (2011), or Spotswood, French, Tapp and Stead (2010). By considering social marketing at a time of dynamic changes in society, the marketing environment and in marketing itself, the paper

reflects on the increasingly diverse social problems which the broadening field is able to address, the myriad of new ways and contexts in which it is and can be applied, and the new possibilities for intervention design and data capture arising from technology advances and developments in mainstream marketing.

In recent times the environment in which social marketers operate has been characterised by disruptive economic turbulence and dramatic social change. Marketers find themselves deep within a digital era, a time of vast technological change, in which fundamental changes in consumer behaviour are taking place and even the most basic assumptions about attitudes and behaviour are challenged. Against this backdrop, the economic effects of recession have hit consumer income and led to swathing cuts to public spending. The shifting political landscape in the UK and the rest of Europe has been accompanied by a rising expectation that voluntary organisations, communities and charities, will become involved in delivering public services. The issues affecting social wellbeing, as well as the available approaches and tools to tackle them, are also more fluid and complex. Questions about the health and lifestyles of the public, their financial literacy and well-being, and the sustainability of how individuals live and consume, feature prominently among the challenges. The kinds of live research projects being undertaken on behalf of charitable funders such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (http://www.jrf.org.uk/work) or by the UK Government's Behavioural Insight Team (https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/behavioural-insights-team) demonstrate the breadth of problems and the range of institutions and approaches involved in tackling them. At the same time, social marketing has undergone a broadening of its own (Gordon, 2013a), and the projects in which practitioners are now involved are a far cry from the days when behaviour change experts focused exclusively on health-related interventions.

These changes and the implications that they have for the context in which social marketers operate and for the scope of their work, provide the impetus for this paper. Although the impact of these changes on the field's current status is discussed in the paper, the aim is to look forward rather than to dwell on social marketing's past. Specifically, the purpose is to consider how the changing environment provides opportunities to further develop social marketing as a vibrant field in its own right. In this regard, the paper builds on other forward-looking work, such as special issues from Marketing Theory (Hastings & Saren 2003b), European Journal of Marketing (Dibb & Carrigan, 2013), and the Journal of Social Marketing (Gordon, 2013a).

The first section provides a brief review of social marketing's origins and stages of development. Three further sections then develop the core themes, namely: (i) the legitimacy of social marketing as a field in its own right; (ii) the implications of the broadening and deepening of social marketing applications, and the consequences for bringing together different stakeholders to enact social change; and (iii) social marketing's relationship with mainstream marketing, and the strengths and opportunities this presents. Each thematic section begins with an exposition of the underpinning ideas, and then places these ideas within the broader context of evolving social marketing research and interventions. In relation to the first theme, the benefits which might accrue from breaking out of traditional academic silos are explored. Concerning the second theme, the consequences for social marketing interventions of the broadening and deepening of the field are considered, with particular scrutiny of what this implies for bringing together different stakeholders to enact social change. The final thematic section considers the strengths and opportunities arising from the social marketing's relationship with mainstream marketing. A range of responses is encouraged to support social marketing's further development, including an inward-facing scrutiny of the applicability of mainstream models, approaches and tools, a broader review of

additional capabilities and resources that might be gleaned from commercial marketing, and an externally-focused consideration of knowledge and good practice from other disciplines.

Social Marketing's Origins and Development

Social marketing involves the application of marketing tools to solve health, social and other problems, which will bring about positive social change. To achieve their aims, social marketers – like commercial marketers – engage in activities that will bring about behaviour change. However, while commercial marketers measure their success in terms of product sales, brand recognition, or market share; social marketers pursue outcomes which will improve individual and societal wellbeing. Social marketing ideas can be applied to a vast array of problems and populations; targeted at global, national, community or individual level; and may draw on an array of behaviour change approaches and marketing tools. The following interventions, all of which fall within the remit of social marketing, illustrate this breadth: health interventions to increase breast feeding rates among new mothers; council-led family education programme on healthy eating; local government initiatives to restrict the consumption of alcohol in town centres; interventions designed to help families manage household budgets and reduce debts; legislative changes to improve food labelling, ban smoking in public places, or restrict alcohol price promotions; community projects to improve waste recycling rates or encourage car sharing; or efforts by sports charities to increase the uptake of swimming lessons, or promote regular cycling (see Andreasen, 2006; Hastings & Domegan, 2014; Kotler and Lee, 2007; or visit the National Social Marketing Council's website at http://www.thensmc.com/for a detailed introduction to social marketing).

Reflecting 40 years of conceptual development, the literature is peppered with definitions of social marketing (French, 2011). These definitions focus to varying degrees on the field's characteristics: namely, that improving the wellbeing of society and the individuals within it requires social change; that behaviour change is a productive means for promoting such transformation; and that marketing tools and techniques, more usually employed in commercial settings to build brands or promote products, can be the basis for such change (Kotler & Lee, 2007; Kotler & Roberto, 1989).

In his description of the "*power of social marketing*", Hastings (2007) describes the first two of these elements as involving "*marketing tools applied to social good*" being "*used to build public awareness and change behaviour*". Rangun and Karim's (1991:3) definition also views social marketing as involving, "*(a) changing attitudes, belief(s), and behaviours of individuals or organisations for a social benefit, and (b) the social change is the primary (rather than the secondary) purpose of the campaign*". Similarly, Kotler and Zaltman (1971) emphasise the use of commercial approaches, speaking of the "*adaptation of commercial marketing technologies to programs designed to influence voluntary behaviour*" (Andreasen 1994:110); while French and Blair-Stevens (2006) focus on the alignment of such techniques to achieve desired societal outcomes. Some of these definitions have been criticised: first, because they do not clearly distinguish between social marketing and other areas, such as health promotion or health education; and secondly, that their focus on changing attitudes may not necessarily deliver the required behaviour change (Andreasen, 1994). The recent publication of a 'consensus definition of social marketing' by the International Marketing Association (iSMA), the European Social Marketing Association (ESMA) and the Australian Association of Social Marketing (AASM), addresses these concerns by clarifying social marketing's relationship with behaviour change approaches. The definition is based on agreed social marketing principles which were refined in consultation with the memberships

of the three associations: "*Social marketing seeks to develop and integrate marketing concepts with other approaches to influence behaviours that benefit individuals and communities for the greater social good*" (http://www.i-socialmarketing.org/assets/social_ marketing_ definition.pdf).

The development of social marketing, its scope, and the manner and contexts in which it is implemented, can readily be tracked (e.g. see Andreasen, 1994; 2012). In the field's early incarnations, the focus was on understanding behaviour at the individual level and on designing well-targeted interventions (Kotler & Lee, 2007; Lazer & Kelly, 1973). Despite social marketers having an enduring interest in behaviour change at the individual level, the scope of interventions has since broadened, as the field has moved upstream and its practitioners have become more strategic in their efforts to tackle population harms. Thus downstream interventions seek to reduce population harms through behaviour change programmes targeted at individuals, or communities (Carroll, Craypo & Samuels, 2000); in which case the term 'midstream' is sometimes used. Such interventions are widely applied in health settings, including to promote healthier eating messages aimed at families (Golan & Crow, 2004; Pettigrew & Pescud, 2013), or increase rates of breast-feeding through peer support (Watt et al., 2007). Cronin & McCarthy (2011:146) suggest that social marketing needs to be anchored within community:

> *Social marketing campaigns typically work to alter an individual's perceptions and attitudes. The targets of these campaigns often aim at internal behavioural influences on the individual; however, in the case of a consumer community such as a subculture, they must aim to influence the cohort that the individual is part of. In this sense, social marketing should very much be grounded in community and the relational aspects of society.*

The notion of upstream intervention acknowledges the role of structural change brought about by legislative or regulatory changes, economic shifts, or technological developments (Hastings, 2012). Upstream social marketing initiatives, therefore, involve disrupting the environment in which a particular behaviour takes place (Clemens, Gernat & Gernat, 2001; Moraes, Carrigan & Leek, 2010). While behaviour change is still necessary to achieve the desired social outcomes, there is an emphasis on disrupting the environment and involving stakeholders who can bring about such changes (Gordon, 2012). Applications of upstream action include legislative and regulatory changes designed to limit problem drinking, reduce levels of smoking (e.g. Hassan, Walsh, Shiu, Hastings & Harris, 2007; Hastings, 2007; Raine, 2010), increase healthy eating, reduce waste and increase recycling rates (Thomas & Sharp, 2013), amongst others. In relation to problem drinking, for example, specific initiatives have focused on the impact of alcohol advertising (Hastings, Anderson, Cooke & Gordon, 2005), limiting drinking in public places (Moore, Perham & Shepherd, 2006), revising licensing laws (MacNaughton & Gillan, 2011), and proposals for minimum unit pricing (Meier, Brennan, & Purshouse, 2010).

Although the more holistic approach to social marketing implied by the move upstream has been generally welcomed (Donovan, 2000; Hastings & Donovan, 2002; Hoek & Jones, 2011), a number of factors have affected the pace of development. First, not all social marketers have embraced the need for "*renewal and refreshment*" with the consequence that the field has been "*somewhat cautious and reactionary*" (Gordon, 2013:203). As such, in some quarters there has remained a narrow focus on individual behaviour change. A second barrier to the field's development is associated with a misunderstanding outside of social marketing circles of what the discipline entails. These problems include narrowly casting the

field as a promotions approach (Hill, 2001), regarding it as social advertising (Smith, 2011) and a poor recognition of its strategic scope or of *"the expanded scope of activities that an experienced social marketers would now recognise as part of their domain"* (Tapp & Smallwood, 2013).

In relation to the move upstream, some dissenting voices have argued against intervening in the structural environment (Laczniack et al., 1979; Wells, 1997), while others have rightly drawn attention to the ethical aspects of such interventions (Gordon, 2011; Spotswood, et al., 2010). Even so, the emphasis on the upstream is now broadly welcomed, and has been accompanied by a move towards a more strategic view of social marketing (Andreasen, 2002; French & Blair-Stevens, 2010). This view acknowledges the value of combining up-, mid-, and downstream approaches, helping to address the previously 'highly constricted' or 'incomplete' understanding of social marketing's scope (Tapp & Spotswood, 2013:207-208).

As the field has embraced a more strategic approach, an increase in multi-faceted interventions which combine upstream, midstream and downstream applications to bring about social change, has been encouraged (e.g. Hoek & Jones, 2011). The variety of marketing tools and techniques which are applied has also been extended (e.g. Hawkins, Bulmer, & Eagle, 2010); and the value of mainstream marketing theory has been explored, including in areas such as value co-creation (Domegan, Collins, Stead, McHugh & Hughes, 2013), the marketing mix (Tapp & Spotswood, 2013); and services marketing (Russell-Bennett, Wood & Previte, 2013).

A perceived narrowing of the gap between social marketing and the marketing mainstream inevitably brings into question the extent to which the former is regarded as being *different*. In a recent paper that moves against social marketing being positioned as sub-field of mainstream marketing, Andreasen (2012) contends that all marketing applications are ultimately concerned with influencing behaviour, irrespective of whether they sell products for commercial gain or tackle social problems. He suggests that social marketing be regarded as one of a number of ways in which mainstream marketing is applied, rather than as a special case, and calls for the following challenges to be addressed. These concern the development of analytical frameworks which fit both social and commercial situations; audience research which measures behavioural as well as financial outcomes; marketing teaching which explains the broad social context in which marketing takes place, then focuses on commercial and social applications; and for public policy and marketing ethics to focus on both commercial and social settings (Andreasen 2012:37).

In practice, the difficulties which have been reported in applying mainstream marketing theory and tools to social marketing problems (see, for example, Tapp & Spotswood, 2013, on the marketing mix), suggest that producing 'one-size-fits-all' approaches may not be straightforward and signal the need for a more nuanced view. Peattie and Peattie (2003:366) are among those who are critical of the suitability of commercial marketing ideas and the applicability of mainstream marketing trends to social contexts. While acknowledging that social change initiatives are "*entwined with, and informed by*" (p. 366) commerce, they call for "*a more thoughtful and selective application that emphasizes the differences between commercial and social marketing*" (Peattie & Peattie, 2003:367), they suggest instead that social marketing should develop its own ideas, vocabulary and principles.

Whether through the broader analytical frameworks which Andreasen (2012) suggests, or by developing new theory and tools as Peattie & Peattie (2003) propose, ensuring the continued development and good health of social marketing will require the distinctiveness of the social

change setting and what this means for the relevance of theory and the applicability of tools to be carefully considered.

Social Marketing's Legitimacy as a Field in its Own Right

Much debate has centred on the legitimacy of social marketing as a field in its own right, during which time researchers have wrestled with questions about what the field is and is not, the extent of its scope and the contexts in which can be applied (e.g. MacFadyen et al. 2003; McDermott, Stead & Hastings, 2005). As Tapp and Spotswood (2013:207) explain, "*significant misunderstanding ... both within the field (Donovan, 2011) and amongst outsiders (Grier & Bryant,* 2005)", has been a feature of this debate. A number of twists and turns have characterised the discussion. The stance taken in the various papers by Andreasen, which chart the development of social marketing, reflects these uncertainties. Thus in his 2002 paper, Andreasen calls for better marketing and branding of social marketing within the social change field. His premise is that social marketing faces competition at a number of different levels and that the "*ultimate test*" of its success "*will be whether social marketing can be established as a superior approach in specific cases that involve specific social programs*" (Andreasen, 2002:5). He explores forms of competition occurring between different levels of intervention and arising from alternative approaches to behaviour change. Thus he describes as competing with each other, interventions dealing with individual behaviour change (downstream), those focusing on communities as the means of intervention delivery through the use of social norms and interpersonal influences (mid-stream) (Farquar et al., 1985), and those which involve intervening in the social structure (upstream) (Wallack, 1990). Though curiously enough, one of those 'twists and turns' mentioned above, is that in later work, Andreasen (2006) is supportive of interventions which combine these elements.

Among the latter type of competition which social marketing faces, Andreasen describes a series of alternative approaches to behaviour change, such as the health belief model (Rosenstock, 1990); stages of changes methods (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983); and social learning theory (Bandura, 1997). Andreasen positions these competing 'brands' as potential threats to social marketing's dominance (see also Hill, 2001). In the years since these comments were made, many more such 'competitors' have emerged, including Michie, van Stralen and West's (2011) Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW), an integrative framework that brings together sources of behaviour, intervention functions and policy categories. The BCW, for example, was developed on the back of a systematic review in which 19 different intervention and policy frameworks were identified, including MINDSPACE, a checklist acronym for guiding policymakers (Institute for Government, 2010); and those drawing on 'nudge' theory (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

The field's preoccupation with questions about its uniqueness or particular character are, perhaps a consequence of this stance, which compares social marketing with other approaches. In this vein, Andreasen (2002) proposed six social marketing benchmarks to be used to test the legitimacy of a social marketing approach, which subsequently were developed by the UK National Social Marketing Centre through the addition of two new benchmarks (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: National Social Marketing Centre Benchmarks for Social Marketing
  1. **Behaviour change**: Intervention seeks to change behaviour and has specific measurable behavioural objectives.
  2. **Audience research/insight**: Formative research is conducted to identify target consumer characteristics and needs. Intervention elements are pre-tested with the target group.
  3. **Segmentation**: Different segmentation variables are applied so that the strategy is tailored to the target segment.
  4. **Exchange**: Consideration is given to what will motivate people to engage voluntarily with the intervention and what benefit (tangible or intangible) will be offered in return.
  5. **Marketing mix**: Intervention consists of promotion (communications) plus at least one other marketing 'P' ('product', 'price', 'place'). Other Ps might include 'policy change' or 'people'.
  6. **Competition**: Intervention considers the appeal of competing behaviours (including current behaviour). The developed intervention strategies seek to minimise the competition.
  7. **Theory**: Using behavioural theories to understand human behaviour and to inform the programmes which are developed.
  8. **Customer orientation**: Attaching importance to understanding the customer, their attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and the social context in which they are placed.

Adapted from: National Social Marketing Council (2014). Social marketing benchmark criteria, accessed on 21st April 2014 at http://www.thensmc.com/sites/default/files/benchmark-criteria-090910.pdf ; Bird, S., (2010). Benchmark criteria for social marketing, *Bristol Social Marketing Centre Spotlight on Social Marketing #2,* accessed on 16th March 2014 at http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/blresearch/bsmc/news.aspx.

These benchmarks are presented as an integrated series of concepts, which capture the breadth of the social marketing field and the knowledge on which it is based (Bird, 2010). They represent a strategic view of social marketing which extends beyond a simple communications campaign or a nudge-based intervention, although these elements may also be part of the social marketing tool kit. In this sense, they reflect current thinking among social marketers, that far from being competitors to the field, different behaviour change theories and approaches are all resources on which practitioners can draw. Consequently, these benchmarks have a useful role to play in grounding social marketing and in showing its relationship with other behaviour change approaches.

Inwardly-focused analysis of this kind, however, must rightly be balanced with a more outward-looking perspective, if social marketing is to continue to develop and grow. The current surge in interest in behaviour change research, as policy makers, national and local government departments, public service providers, non-profit and profit organisations recognise its ability to intervene and change behaviour, provides a supportive environment for this development. Policy makers around the world are enthused by the potential for interventions which encourage positive behaviour change of one sort or another. They have available a diverse range of psychological and sociological behaviour change theories and models, explaining behaviour at the individual and societal level. Darnton's (2008) detailed review offers a constructive view of the connections and interrelationships between these different theoretical approaches. For example, early models of individual change grounded in economic utility theory, adopt a rational view of behaviour in which decisions result from a

rational examination of the costs and benefits of particular behaviours (Fishbein, 1973). Behavioural economics and socio-psychological theories have challenged this rational view (Shove, 2010; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008), suggesting that when faced with overwhelming levels of information, individuals take cognitive shortcuts to make decisions. The UK government's Behavioural Insights Team which, reflecting its interest in behavioural economics is also sometimes referred to as the 'Nudge Unit', works with a range of public and private bodies on a range of health, sustainability, payment of taxes, and charitable giving projects (https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/behavioural-insights-team). While the focus and methods of these theories differ and no single approach offers a 'magic bullet', there is no doubting the role that this trans-disciplinary trajectory of behaviour change research has to play in social marketing (e.g. Burchell, Rettie & Patel, 2012). Speaking about these "*competing paradigms that also challenge policy makers to approach citizens in different ways*", Moseley and Stoker (2012:5) refer to these *"insights from behavioural economics, social marketing and cognitive psychology, and corresponding programmes of policy activity [that are] underway at the local and national level both in the UK and elsewhere (McKenzie-Mohr, 2000; Andreasen, 2002; Halpern et al., 2004; Cialdini, 2007; Knott et al., 2007; Dolan et al., 2010)"*. Indeed, to miss this opportunity would be dangerous. In lamenting the preoccupation of social marketing with promulgating a restrictive view of the field, Spotswood et al. (2012:164) suggest that practitioners should "…*be criticised for missing this innovative wave*".

If we consider social marketing within this broader behaviour change context, its potential is magnified, rather than reduced. Behaviour change research often takes place in discipline silos, and the same situation applies to social marketing. Public health experts study behaviour change in relation to addiction, obesity, problem drinking, and smoking cessation; personal finance researchers examine savings/investments and problems of debt; transport researchers are concerned with car and public transport use, as well as with safety issues such as speeding and drink driving; while environment experts concern themselves with how we can live more sustainably. Many behaviour change studies focus on particular communities or groups in society (Gordon, Moodie, Eadie & Hastings, 2010; Zaidi, Govindji & Ali, 2008) or emphasise certain regional areas (Lindridge, MacAskill, Gnich, Eadie & Holme, 2013). Yet the researchers involved are united in seeking change which will have positive implications for individuals and society, and often draw on similar theories and approaches as they do so. For example, Lindridge et al. (2013) focus on the effectiveness of a social marketing communications campaign to deliver Childsmile, an oral health programme delivered in Scotland, applying a social ecological model to better understand the impact of particular institutions and of the environment on behaviour change. Although Zaidi et al.'s (2008) focus is on delivering a healthy eating intervention to Sikh and Hindu communities, these researchers are also seeking to better understand the effectiveness of institutions in supporting change. In both cases, as with Gordon et al. (2010), the interventions are motivated by the desire for positive social change.

Rather than lamenting the missed opportunity to share learning and to collaborate across fields, the time is right to build capacity around such work and to facilitate the sharing of ideas across different fields. For social marketing, as for other maturing academic fields, "*critical debate, exchanges of ideas, [and] reflexive practice*" (Gordon, 2013:203) helps safeguard against stagnation and feeds the development with fresh ideas. Even so, social marketers should not allow a preoccupation on what is, and what is not, 'authentic' social marketing to detract from outwardly-focused research that seeks new directions, considers the applicability of theories, and tests and adapts methods and technologies. Such examinations should consider a greater sharing of ideas, not only between social marketing and the

marketing mainstream, but more widely with researchers working in other areas of behaviour change. This could include establishing better cross-disciplinary networks to share ideas and methods, or pursuing research funding opportunities as part of cross-disciplinary teams and building collaborative projects which combine behaviour change ideas and approaches. For example, sustainability researchers routinely use respondent diaries in their data gathering, an approach which social marketers working in other settings might well more widely utilise.

Broadening and Deepening the Social Marketing Field

The move upstream for social marketing has been accompanied by the need for a more strategic approach to designing interventions (French & Blair-Stevens, 2010). Delivering the holistic and multi-layered interventions required to integrate the upstream, midstream and downstream, often involves a number of different stakeholders. Solutions to late-night problem drinking in city centres might necessitate bringing together the local council, the police, those responsible for licensing, local health bodies, and businesses offering entertainment and selling alcohol; each of which has particular interests and needs. All too often, however, the efficacy of complex social marketing initiatives needing multiple partners is compromised because the adopted approach is insufficiently systematic. Polonsky (2013:1384) notes that groups such as governments which implement interventions may do so in a 'fragmented' manner, with little co-ordination around the area of concern. As he explains, the weight-loss industry is an example that,

> *... falls under the domain of health authorities, food regulators and communications regulators, just to name a few. As a result there is often a lack of integrated coordination amongst social marketers within each responsible body, which prevents a comprehensive coverage of the social marketing activities in regard to the issue of obesity.*

In this section, the consequences of the broadening and deepening of social marketing are considered, with a particular emphasis on the implications for bringing together different stakeholders to enact social change. In so doing, it is recognised that despite widespread acceptance of upstream and midstream interventions (Andreasen, 2006), more work is needed to build the required expertise if the move's full potential is to be realised (Gordon, 2013b; Hoek & Jones, 2011). In particular, social marketers must become adept at working with the kinds of stakeholders involved in delivering upstream and midstream interventions. These stakeholders include, but are not limited to policy makers, regulators, charities, community organisations, corporates, educators and the media. Although the social marketing field has built considerable expertise over many years of individual-level behaviour change, there is much less experience of working with this wider stakeholder group. A greater understanding is, therefore, needed of how these stakeholders can be most effectively reached, and of the required processes to engage and work with them.

In a recent paper in which he examines how to unlock the potential of the upstream, Gordon (2013b:1528) is critical of what he sees as a lack "*...of key principles and guidelines for utilising upstream social marketing*" and calls for social marketers to recognise "*…that these groups are target audiences, with influences, motivations, needs and wants, barriers and incentives, and specific behavioural goals, just like downstream audiences*" (p. 1529). This implies that marketing tools and techniques, such as consumer behaviour research, market segmentation and the marketing mix, which have successfully been applied in downstream contexts now need to be directed at this new audience. In order to influence the power brokers who are able to bring about structural change, social marketers must also embrace

their role as 'activists' (Wymer, 2010), becoming involved in policy forums and developing new skills in advocacy and public relations (Gordon, 2012).

The second area in which social marketers need to develop expertise is in relation to the partnerships with upstream and midstream stakeholders that are needed to deliver effective social marketing interventions. As Polonsky's (2013) weight-loss example suggests, the efficacy of the best intentioned initiatives can seriously be compromised by poor stakeholder co-ordination. A further complexity is that these partnerships increasingly involve both commercial and non-commercial bodies, with the consequence that a mix of social and commercial outcomes must be delivered.

Social marketers can expand their understanding of such matters by engaging with research carried out in other areas of marketing and in other disciplines. Initiatives that bring together multiple organisations have been discussed in a number of contexts, including in relation to the management of information technology (e.g. Tan et al., 2009), tourism management (e.g. Erkus-Ozturk & Eraydin, 2010; Arnabaldi & Spiller, 2011), and construction management (e.g. Leiringer & Schweber, 2010). Typically these studies report on collaborations that occur in response to a complex problem, which one stakeholder alone cannot solve. The relevance of a stakeholder perspective within marketing itself has also been established (e.g. Carrigan, 1995), and the application of stakeholder theory to marketing problems has taken place (e.g. Polonsky, 1996). For example, in introducing the concept of the 'harm chain', Polonsky, Carlson and Fry (2003) apply a stakeholder management approach to interrogate the harms that can arise from marketing exchanges.

A consequence of the interdependence and uncertainty that stakeholders face when tackling complex problems, is that they adopt collaborative strategies to optimise the benefits accrued (Jamal & Getz, 1995). In such instances, stakeholder analysis can be useful in shedding light on the power, interests and interconnectedness of different partners (Eden & Ackermann, 1998; Mitchell *et al.,* 1997). Although such approaches have generally been applied in commercial settings (e.g. Jamal, 2004), their ability to interrogate the collaborations occurring between different stakeholders (Bramw & Sharman, 1999; Vernon *et al*., 2005), can readily be applied to achieving social outcomes. For example, the sustainable growth of the world's cities and the daily lives of huge numbers of citizens will, in the future, be seriously challenged by problems such as securing water supplies, supplying sufficient energy, and managing traffic and mobility. Although governments will play a major role in tackling these difficulties, they will not be able to solve them alone. Rather, as Macomber (2013:42) explains, they will involve the co-ordination of public and private sector partners, and will rely on "*… large amounts of capital, exceptional managerial skill, and significant alignment of interests [which] abound in the private sector*".

Although the increasing complexity of stakeholder partnerships involved in delivering interventions is partly the result of social marketing's move upstream, it is also caused by "*…a shift in political discourse as policy makers and practitioners have become concerned to facilitate the involvement of local people*" in tackling social problems and issues (Dobbs & Moore, 2002, p.157). Thus governments now recognise the benefits of involving communities in setting priorities and in collaborating to deliver effective outcomes that are more likely to meet the needs of local people (Watt et al., 2000). The underlying rationale is that the multifaceted and complex health and social problems, which social marketers tackle, can often benefit from community based approaches. The UK government, for example, has as part of its debt reduction strategy sought to increase the involvement of community groups and the voluntary sector in service delivery through its so-called 'Big Society' approach. The

aim was to "…*increase the number of people engaged in the running and ownership of local services and assets*" (Communities and Local Government, 2009:5), with potential benefits seen to include "*...a new cadre of active citizens, owning, directing and running a service as well as providing good value for money for local authorities and other public bodies*". This kind of initiative is indicative of a wider trend towards more holistic government (Perri 6, Leat, Seltzer & Stoker, 1999) and the delivery/management of public services through New Public Management (NPM) models (O'Flynn, Blackman & Halligan, 2011). These are deliberately cross-boundary, collaborative and cross-sector approaches, involving combinations of government, non-government, public, private and non-profit organisations. Examples include approaches on integrated government (e.g. Stoker, 2006), new public governance (e.g. Osbourne, 2006). [Further details of this literature stream are available in O'Flynn & Wanna, 2008; Osborne & Brown, 2005; and Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002].

One example of community-based approaches working in action, involves interventions tackling health and other issues that are delivered through faith-based organizations (Paton, Ali & Taylor, 2009; Resnicow et al., 2004). The role of faith organisations working in collaboration with government agencies and charities to deliver welfare services – sometimes referred to as 'enterprise theology' (Voyce, 2003) – is increasingly recognized. Such organisations tend to be highly visible in their communities and deeply embedded within the day-to-day lives of local people, making them obvious partners for health and social behaviour-change initiatives. In particular, they can provide access to 'hard to reach' groups, which may be difficult achieve through other channels (Campbell et al., 2007; Harris, Hutchison & Cairns, 2005; Stritt, 2008). Furthermore, as the role of faith organisations often extends beyond the delivery of religious service to the wider emotional support of the community, it is possible to influence behaviour at multiple levels.

Community-based participation research (CBPR), is one of a number of approaches which have been used in these kinds of settings to involve communities in tackling health and social problems, and from which social marketers can usefully learn. CBPR works by combining resources and building collaboration between different groups (Resnicow et al., 2004), and by integrating knowledge, promoting co-learning and empowerment for the benefit of all partners (Israel, Schultz, Parker & Becker, 1998). A feature of this stakeholder alliance is that it provides a setting that brings together the upstream, midstream and downstream elements of an intervention. For example, a project supported by the British Heart Foundation (BHF), that aimed to reduce salt consumption among UK Hindus and Sikhs, targeted members of these communities through their places of worship (Zaidi et al., 2008). The intervention achieved its target of a five percent reduction in salt consumption through a range of stakeholders working in different ways and at different levels, including community based (midstream) action involving qualified dieticians who trained cooks at Hindu Temples and Sikh Gurdwara to lessen the salt content of communal meals, and by disseminating messages to individual congregants via faith leaders to encourage changing eating habits in the home.

The ideas from specific approaches like CBPR, as well as from the broader stakeholder management literature, shed light on how such partnerships can be used to bring about social change. They reveal, for example, how the influence and level of involvement of different partners and the extent to which the interests of each are served, can impact upon intervention effectiveness. Given the difficulties which can be faced in engaging stakeholders in bringing about change, such insights are crucial. The problems faced by the UK government's Big Society initiative are indicative of what can go wrong. Despite the considerable political support and publicity surrounding its launch, the initiative has been criticized for failing to

deliver on its promises and for the strain it is placing on the voluntary sector (e.g. Slocock, 2012; Economist, 2014; Helm & Coman, 2012; Hetherington, 2013).

Those seeking to deliver interventions through partnerships involving multiple stakeholders, or researchers who are investigating such problems, need a clear understanding of the barriers which they might face. Issues can arise as a result of the varying interests of different stakeholders, difficulties negotiating imbalances in power and resource between partners, or differing perceptions of the problem behaviour. A reflexive approach can be helpful in understanding these perspectives and influences and addressing the tensions between stakeholders. Deeper insights are readily available in the stakeholder management literature (e.g. Ackermann & Eden, 2011; Bryson, 2004; Freeman, 1984) and, to a lesser extent, from applications in marketing (e.g. Polonsky et al., 2003). This literature classifies the challenges arising when managing such stakeholders into a number of broad areas: namely, the need to identify who the specific stakeholders are, the importance of understanding the dynamics occurring between these stakeholders, and the need for stakeholder management strategies that aid the management of the relationships. Table 1 explains these challenges and provides practical guidance for social marketers seeking to manage them (see also Ali, Dibb and Carrigan, 2013).

Table 1: Managing Stakeholder Challenges

STAKEHOLDER CHALLENGE	ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGE
Different interests and agendas can bring partners into conflict, particularly in circumstances where social and commercial outcomes need to be balanced (e.g. Enz, 2002).	*Exploring the differing needs and interests of stakeholders and clarifying the objectives of each at the intervention outset, helps to manage expectations and surface issues which might later cause problems. Identifying members for a project team made up of representatives from partners ensures that the views of each will be heard.*
Imbalances in resources and power between stakeholders need to be carefully managed; e.g. community-based partners which often have fewer, tangible resources and may lack experience relative to government agencies, are likely to feel disadvantaged (e.g. Dobbs & Moore, 2002).	*Reviewing the resources and capabilities that each partner will bring early in the project and formalizing the roles and responsibilities of each party can lessen such conflicts. Setting a regular schedule of project team meetings ensures a setting in which such issues can be resolved.*
Misunderstandings and other 'outsider-insider' tensions that arise between community partners and stakeholders, can detrimentally affect outcomes (e.g. Wallerstein, 1999).	*Ensuring good communication between partners reduces the severity of these issues, as problems can be discussed as soon as they arise. Although regular meetings play an important role, they should be supplemented with other channels for day-to-day communication, such as weekly telecons for regular email exchanges.*
Different ways of conceptualizing the problem behaviour to be changed can cause conflicts in agreeing priorities or approach (e.g. Cummings & Doh, 2000); e.g. a health charity seeking improved eating practices may be motivated by epidemiological evidence, while a faith organisation helping to deliver the programme will have greater awareness of the acceptability of certain approaches on the ground.	*Partners need to recognise that the bringing together of distinctive expertise from different stakeholders is the main strength of these projects. Ways of working must be agreed which respect these diverse specific skills and capabilities, so that their value to the project is not undermined.*

The discussion reveals that a consequence of the broadening and deepening of social marketing applications has been the adoption of holistic approaches that integrate a range of upstream, midstream and downstream elements. The number and complexity of partnerships required to deliver such interventions are increasing, with the consequence that careful co-ordination of the involved stakeholders and their needs is needed. Drawing on knowledge from other disciplines has a productive role to play in helping social marketers come to terms with the challenges that these partnerships bring.

Social Marketing's Relationship with Mainstream Marketing

The relationship between social marketing and mainstream marketing is a complex one. These complexities stem from criticisms of marketing's links with commercialism and consumption, and from the negative social impacts for which they are blamed (Hastings & Angus, 2011; Peattie & Peattie, 2003). The use of aggressive marketing tactics is one aspect of commercialism which has been condemned by those who disapprove of the resulting over-consumption (Hamilton 2007; Hastings 2012) and denounce the effects on the vulnerable. Baker, Gentry & Rittenburg, (2004:134) describe the "… *state of powerlessness that arises from an imbalance in marketplace interactions or from the consumption of marketing messages and products"*. These views align with the concerns of Thomas (1999), who speaks of embracing "*... the capacity of marketing to operate outside the cockpit of capitalism, to build cooperation and trust"*, and suggests that "*... a form of 'social capitalism' will be vital for global survival"*. Others, however, regard "*the distinction between social marketing and commercial marketing [as] artificially created"* (Polonsky, 2012:1387), and as a barrier to moving the field forward (Andreasen, 2012).

While acknowledging these problems, this section advances the debate by scrutinizing the common ground between social and commercial marketing, and by considering what more can be done to unlock the potential of commercial marketing models, approaches and tools for social marketers. Such potential is best realised by acknowledging inherent limitations in some of these mainstream approaches and finding creative ways to adapt them; surfacing and addressing shortfalls in relevant social marketing capabilities and resources; and drawing on the knowledge and experiences of behaviour change researchers from other fields. Three examples provide the framing for this discussion. These examples involve models, approaches and tools which are routinely applied in mainstream marketing, but for which the applicability social marketing has been questioned or where further development potential exists. The suitability of the first for social marketing contexts, the marketing mix, is a model about which there has already been considerable debate. The second, market segmentation, a prominent marketing approach originally developed for commercial applications, is now widely used to target behaviour change interventions (Darnton, 2008). The third, new technology data capture tools, already enthusiastically embraced in commercial settings offer huge promise for social marketers. These examples are chosen because they illustrate the range of necessary responses to unlock the potential of such approaches: namely, an 'inward' scrutiny of the relevance of existing models, approaches and tools; a wider view of capabilities and resources that might be leveraged from commercial marketing, and an externally-focused surveillance of theory, knowledge and good practice from other disciplines.

The Marketing Mix

Originally adapted for social marketing by Kotler and Zaltman (1971), the applicability of the traditional marketing mix to social marketing problems has recently been criticised by social

marketing scholars (Gordon, 2012; Peattie & Peattie, 2003; Tapp and Spotswood, 2013). In reviewing the efficacy of the marketing mix in social marketing settings, Tapp and Spotswood (2013:207) find the model wanting in its ability to handle the "*subtlety and range of interventions*" which social marketing requires. A systematic examination by Peattie and Peattie (2003) of the marketing mix elements articulates several ways in which it is unsuitable for the social marketing context. For example, although the notion of 'product' is often considered akin to the social marketing proposition (an example they give is that "*exercise is beneficial*" Peattie & Peattie, 2003:371), this is not always the case. While the link a product and a proposition may sometimes be close, such as for an intervention that involves the provision of a personal fitness plan; in others, such as national policy change requiring obese citizens to enroll on exercise programmes [this author's examples], the connections are less obvious. Similarly, Peattie and Peattie (2003) link the notion of 'price' to the 'costs' associated with changing a particular behaviour; arguing that fundamental differences between these two concepts, limits the value of social marketers considering 'price' at all. Peattie and Peattie's (2003) underlying message is to avoid the indiscriminate use of commercial ideas and to pay greater attention to their applicability in social marketing settings.

Building on this theme, Tapp and Spotswood (2013) propose a new model for developing social marketing interventions, the COM-SM framework, which "*reworks the association between behaviour change insights and the social marketing mix*" (p.206). Like Stead, Gordon, Angus & McDermott (2007), Tapp and Spotswood (2013) are critical of the marketing mix's poor explanatory power for social marketing problems. They criticise the internal orientation of the 4Ps because it is led by managers and planners rather than by customers, and call for the use of relationship-based approaches which would enable greater citizen engagement (see also Hastings, 2007). The COM-SM framework is built around the capability opportunity motivation (COM) model, the theoretical basis for which is well-established. Michie, van Stralen & West (2011:3) define the elements of the model in the following way:

> *Capability: The individual's psychological and physical capacity to engage in the activity concerned. Motivation: All those brain processes that energise and direct behaviour, not just goals and conscious decision making. Opportunity: All the factors that lie outside the individual that make the behaviour possible or prompt it.*

In producing their model, Tapp and Spotswood link social marketing activities with the COM elements via five "design clusters" (p. 215) of social marketing programmes. These are: (i) promotion – the basic use of communication techniques; (ii) nudge – encouraging automatic and sub-conscious behaviour change in specific settings; (iii) rewards and exchanges – adopting traditional and conscious exchange programmes, involving benefits for changing behaviour; (iv) service and support – undertaking changes in the design and delivery of services; (v) relationships and communities – the involvement of communities and other stakeholders in the creation of social marketing solutions. The degree of intervention needed is deemed likely to increase from the first of these clusters (promotion) to the fifth (relationships and communities). Thus for the promotion cluster, where the required capabilities and opportunities are already in place, a relatively basic promotion approach is likely to be sufficient. In comparison, for cluster four (service and support), although those involved in delivering interventions might be motivated to make required changes, the opportunity and/or capability to do so may be lacking and more major intervention may be needed.

The significance of this example is in the authors' scrutiny of a mainstream model that has previously been applied in social marketing, which has exposed its shortcomings and led to the development of a new model. Similar examinations have recently been undertaken of other mainstream ideas, including developing services thinking (Lefebvre, 2012; Russell-Bennett, Wood & Previte, 2013), and value co-creation (Domegan, Collins, Stead, McHugh & Hughes, 2013). The insights from such work suggest that social marketers should extend their attention to other mainstream models and approaches.

Market Segmentation

Market segmentation has long been described as a dominant concept and "*one of the major ways of operationalizing the marketing concept*" (Wind, 1978: 317), aiding the selection and implementation of marketing strategy. Although segmentation was originally developed with commercial applications in mind, it is now widely adopted in the targeting of behaviour change interventions (Darnton, 2008). Yet its application in social marketing settings has lagged behind its use in the commercial sector. While commercial marketers, such as Amazon, have embraced the 'segment of one' and the notion of mass customisation to target customers with a range of other products they might like, segmentation schemes used to achieve social ends tend to be much simpler. An example is the seven population segments that the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has generated to underpin interventions that aim to encourage more environmentally responsible behaviour (Defra, 2006). The segments, which are described in Figure 2, are linked to individuals' lifestyles, attitudes, behaviours, values, motivations and the barriers they perceive that prevent them from behaving sustainably. Profiling of the segments reflects the ability and willingness of individuals to undertake positive environmental behaviour, as well as their demographic construction.

Figure 2: Defra's Seven Environmental Population Segments

1. **Greens**
"I try to conserve whenever I can… a lot of people don't think like that."

2. **Consumers with a Conscience**
"Going away is important… I'd find it hard to give up, well I wouldn't, so that [carbon off-setting] would make me feel better."

3. **Wastage Focused**
"We now turn the thermostat down… This is to cut down the bill, but then you start to think about the environment as well."

4. **Currently Constrained**
"I am on a restricted budget so I cannot afford organic food… When I earn more in the future I definitely will buy it."

5. **Basic Contributors**
"Organic food – you pay twice the price and how can you be sure that it really is organic?"

6. **Long Term Restricted**
"I can't afford a car so I don't drive. I use the train instead."

7. **Dis-interested**
"Those Greenies, they're too concerned about the environment… they need to chill out, live a little."

Source: DEFRA (December 2006), *An Environmental Behaviours Strategy for DEFRA: Scoping Report*, Derived from Box 4 and Figure: The seven population segments and Figure 9: Positioning of Segments: Ability and Willingness to Act, 32-33, *Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs*, London.

As the descriptions suggest, the insights revealed by the segments provide useful insights for targeting behaviour-change interventions. Having a clearer understanding of factors which promote and impede positive environmental behaviour enables behavioural goals to be set at the segment level, and for specific interventions to be designed and targeted at certain consumer groups. For example, the *greens*, with their ready interest in positive environmental outcomes, are likely candidates for pro-environmental goods and services; while the *waste focussed segment*, are seen as positively disposed to interventions which reduce waste, such as home composting. Even so, this rather 'static' segmentation is a far cry from the sophisticated, evolving schemes adopted by commercial organisations such as Amazon, Tesco and HSBC.

Insights into why segmentation in social marketing settings has lagged behind can readily be gleaned from the commercial setting (Dibb, 2013). The literature examining segmentation effectiveness identifies a number of resource-related implementation barriers, including shortages in appropriate data, suitably skilled personnel, and financial resources (Jenkins & McDonald, 1997; Weinstein, 2004). Several of these barriers resonate strongly in social marketing settings. As a consequence of the contexts in which social marketing occurs, many practitioners lack formal marketing training, falling into the group that Gummesson (1991) describes as 'part-time marketers'. Shortfalls in skills are likely to be particularly acute in more strategic areas (Neiger, Thackeray, Barnes & McKenzie, 2003; Tapp & Spotswood, 2013). Strategies to address these skill shortages include the targeted recruitment of individuals with marketing skills; enrolling on training programmes designed to transfer some of these commercial skills to the social marketing setting (for example, see http://www.thensmc.com); or engaging consultants to advise on specific issues.

The availability of suitable data also presents particular challenges, since social marketing practitioners typically do not have the ready access to vast transactional data sets enjoyed by their commercial counterparts. The ethical and privacy issues involved in data gathering from vulnerable groups is a further complication, especially for practitioners engaged in health-related or other sensitive behaviour-change projects. Promising developments in data capture technologies such as lifelogging, are one of the avenues that social marketers should explore in addressing their needs for such data.

Data Capture Technologies

Advances in technology, such as interactive technologies like smart phone apps, in-home sensors, palm-top consumer panels with dashboards and infographics, are transforming the potential for gathering behavioural data and the provision of interfaces for behaviour change interventions. These technologies enable detailed insights into the behaviour of individuals and have the potential to transform interactive interventions. The Defra data profile, for example, could be raised to a new level by combining the variables it uses with an 'in the moment' record of actual behaviour. In the area of health and wellbeing, great strides are already being made. Commercial applications include apps which enable runners, cyclists and other fitness enthusiasts to monitor their heart-rate and other vital signs while working out and track their training performance over time and against personal targets. A plethora of smart phone apps offering diet plans and healthy eating advice is available to consumers seeking to lose weight, and slimming clubs such as Slimming World are increasingly integrating such technology into the service they provide. In the UK, Weight Watchers issued a profits warning, attributing their falling share price to business lost to health app providers (BBC Business News, 2.08.13). The interactivity of these technologies, their

ability to both capture data and transmit information holds particular promise for the design of social marketing interventions.

These technologies could help to elevate the sophistication of social marketing interventions, providing the means for both gathering behavioural data then implementing carefully targeted, tailored interventions on the basis of consumers' revealed behaviour. Interventions of this nature could bring the benefits of 'mass customisation' and the 'segment of one' within the reach of social marketers. The possibilities become clearer by considering the data gathering approach known as life-logging. Based on the idea of 'total capture' of personal information, this approach is an extreme version of using technology to gather such data. Reflecting the real-time marketing trend reported in the commercial marketing press (Roderick, 2013), life-logging uses a variety of technologies including wearable sensors, GPS tracking, and smart phone apps to enable 'in the moment' behaviour gathering and rapid intervention responses. As Sellen and Whittaker, (2010:72) explain, the advantage is that, "*many everyday activities can be captured automatically and comprehensively through digital tools that allow us to not only store important content, but also contextual details of the activities to help access the content later*".

Devices used for life-logging are able to measure "*...cognitive, behavioural, and affective phenomena as they occur in natural settings and in, or near real-time*" (Cohn, Hunter-Reel, Hagman & Mitchell, 2011:1), in a minimally invasive and cost-effective manner. The compelling benefits which Cohn et al., (2011) associate with using such technology to measure behaviour are now described, but here the description is extended so that the specific relevance of these points to social marketing researchers is highlighted. First, actual rather than reported behaviour is measured, so recall problems associated with people self-reporting behaviour or saying what they *will* do are eliminated; social marketers undertaking health-related studies focusing on exercise regimes, or those interested in healthy eating practices, exercise routines or smoking prevention, are among those who could benefit from such insights. Taken as a whole, the data amassed from a particular region, cultural community, or even from those suffering a particular health condition, could also become the basis for intervention utilising social norms and other comparative data. Secondly, data can be gathered continuously and over a long timeframe, with the consequence that rarer behaviours can be captured; for those designing interventions to encourage more sustainable travel patterns, for example such information could provide a more holistic view of how particular travel behaviours fit within individuals' lifestyles. Thirdly, time sequencing of behavioural antecedents and outcomes can be achieved; this sequencing would enable those concerned with problem spending and debt; for example, to more closely examine the relationship between antecedents such as exposure to marketing promotions, the impulse purchase of products (and the use of credit), and problem debt.

A fuller appreciation of the role of which apps and other mobile technologies will play in social marketing's growth, both in terms of their contribution to data gathering and responsive interventions, will emerge over time. Such tools may be particularly useful in certain areas of behaviour change (Piwek, 2014): for example, their role in data capture and intervention in relation to promoting more sustainable behaviours, such as reducing energy consumption (Bourgeois, van der Linden, Price & Kortuem, 2013; Fischer, 2008) is already well established.

There is also a growing appetite for using such technologies in many health settings; for example, high technology sensors that monitor physical exercise and food intake aiding the drive against obesity (BBC, 10.12.13). Inevitably, however, there will also be limits to its

usage in this context: although 'sobriety' ankle bracelets are now being used to monitor the drinking levels of criminals whose offences were alcohol induced (Watt, 2012), those who abuse alcohol and drugs are notoriously adept at eluding measures to track their behaviour. Even so, data capture technologies may be a useful means for recording the experiences of those affected by the drinking or drug taking habits of others. This is one area in which social marketers will benefit from looking beyond their own discipline base at the knowledge and application of tools, techniques and technologies being applied in other areas of behaviour change, such as sustainability, transport and social movements; by those from disciplines including computer science, technology, transport studies, and geography.

Conclusion

Social marketing has, for many years, been trapped by the need to prove its authenticity and to respond to questions about its legitimacy. Such concentration on scope, substance and ethical questions has, without doubt, been a necessary step in establishing the field on the academic stage. Few can now doubt that social marketing has reached greater maturity or question its contribution to enacting social change. A growth in research funding calls which prioritise behaviour change, the establishment of new social marketing journals and special issues, the rapidly rising number of social marketing publications, increase in staff recruitment and in academic research units focusing on the field, are all testament to the field's legitimacy. Yet as recent publications attest, considerable untapped potential remains for social marketers to leverage assets from commercial marketing in the journey to '*broker [the field's] way forward*' (Hastings & Saren, 2003a:315).

Recent transformations of the environment and society have brought a raft of new opportunities for behaviour change research and have elevated social marketing's prospects to new heights. Against this backdrop, the challenge is for the field to remain free of its historical restraints so that it can continue to broaden and grow. The goal for social marketers should be to bring the field to new contexts and social problems, to improve the quality of social marketing interventions delivered within the settings in which it is applied, and to embrace new intervention design, drawing on innovative practices and technologies from mainstream in marketing and beyond. To achieve these goals, an outward-looking and progressive approach to developing the field is needed. Such a perspective should seek inspiration both from within, and beyond, the marketing mainstream encompassing the sharpest new ideas and innovative working practices from elsewhere.

This paper culminates with a call for the field to continue on this trajectory, by embracing and celebrating the raft of opportunities which transformations in society and the wider environment are bringing. Such development will be contingent on social marketers sharing and adapting commercial marketing ideas, reworking concepts from other disciplines, and building theories of their own. Three of the many potential areas which warrant further reflection, or which should be the focus for further research include:

1. The pursuit of stronger networks and a wider sharing of ideas within marketing itself and also across discipline silos. Greater collaboration with behaviour change researchers from other fields, whether through formal networks, joint publication or by working together on projects, brings the opportunity to share best practice ideas and approaches.
2. Better understanding of the increasingly complex interventions needed to bring about social change and of the stakeholders involved in delivering them. The broadening and deepening of social marketing applications, the move upstream and the embracing of more strategic approaches, raise many questions about how best to manage the involved

partnerships. Borrowing theoretical concepts from other fields with a more advanced understanding of stakeholder management is essential to ensure that these challenges are well managed.

3. By exploring the common ground between social and commercial marketing, rather than focusing on the differences, social marketers should uncover new ways to unlock the potential of commercial marketing approaches and to benefit from innovative technologies. Despite a spate of publications examining new applications of commercial marketing ideas to social marketing problems, much untapped potential remains to leverage commercial marketing's assets.

References

Ackermann, F., & Eden, C. (2011). Strategic management of stakeholders: theory and practice. *Long Range Planning, 44*, 179-196.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2010.08.001

Andreasen, A.R. (1994). Social marketing: its definition and domain.*Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *13*(1),108-14.

Andreasen, A.R. (1997). From ghetto marketing to social marketing: bringing social relevance to mainstream marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *16*(1), 129-131.

Andreasen, A.R. (2002). Marketing social marketing in the social change marketplace. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *21*(1), 3-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jppm.21.1.3.17602

Andreasen, A.R. (2003). The life trajectory of social marketing: some implications. *Marketing Theory*, *3*(3), 293-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147059310333004

Andreasen, A.R. (2006), *Social Marketing in the 21st Century*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Andreasen, A.R. (2012).Rethinking the relationship between social/nonprofit marketing and commercial marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *31*(1), 36-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jppm.09.035

Arnaboldi M.,& Spiller, N. (2011). Actor-network theory and stakeholder collaboration: the case of cultural districts. *Tourism Management,32*(3), 641–654. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.05.016

Baker, S.M., Gentry, J.W., & Rittenburg, T.L. (2005).Building understanding of the domain of consumer vulnerability. *Journal of Macromarketing*, *25*(2), 128-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0276146705280622

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.

BBC Business News, (2013). Weight watchers shares fall 19% on profit warning, August 2013, accessed 8.8.13 at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-23556277.

Bramwell, B.,& Sharman A. (1999).Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(2), 392–415. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0160-7383(98)00105-4

Bryson, J.M. (2004). What to do when stakeholders matters: stakeholder identification and analysis techniques. *Public Management Review, 6,* 21-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719030410001675722

Burchell, K., Rettie, R., & Patel, K. (2013). Marketing social norms: social marketing and the 'social norm approach'. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *12*, (1-9). http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cb.1395

Campbell, M.K., Hudson, M.A., Resnicow, K., Blakeney, N., Paxton, A., & Baskin, M. (2007). Church based health promotion interventions: evidence and lessons learned. *Annual Review Public Health*, *28*, 213-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.28.021406.144016

Carroll, A., Craypo, L., & Samuels, S. (2000). *Evaluating nutrition and physical activity social marketing campaigns: a review of the literature for use in community campaigns*. Davis, CA: University of California.

Cialdini, R.B. (2007). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: Collins Business.

Clemens, Rea, Gernat, R.D. &Gernat, M.L.A. (2001).Developing nutrition interventions: a synthesis of evidence to guide planning, in *Developing Nutrition Interventions – A Synthesis of Evidence to Guide Planning*. Ontario: The Prevention Unit, Division of Preventive Oncology Cancer Care.

Communities and Local Government(2009).*Government Response to the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee Report "Market Failure? – Can the Traditional Marketing Survive*.October. London: Crown Copyright.

Cohn, A.M., Hunter-Reel, D. Hagman, B.T.,& Mitchell, J. (2011). Promoting behaviour change from alcohol use through mobile technology: the future of ecological momentary assessment.*Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *35*(12), 2209-2215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2011.01571.x

Cronin, J.M.,& McCarthy, M.B. (2011). Preventing game over: a study of the situated food choice influences within the videogames subculture.*Journal of Social Marketing*, *1*(2), 133-153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111141887

Cummings, J.L., &Doh, J.P. (2000). Identifying who matters: mapping key players in multiple environments. *California Management Review, 42* 83-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/41166034

Darnton, A. (2008). *Practical Guide: An Overview of Behaviour Change Models and Their Uses,*London: Government Social Research Unit, HM Treasury, Crown Copyright.

DEFRA (December 2006).*An Environmental Behaviours Strategy for DEFRA: Scoping Report*, London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Dibb, S. (2013). The emergence of new domains for segmentation – the rapid rise of non-commercial applications, In L. Simkin, *To Boardrooms and Sustainability: The Changing Nature of Segmentation*, Henley White Paper, Henley Business School, p. 37.

Dibb, S.,& Carrigan, M. (2013). Editorial. Social marketing transformed - Kotler, Polonsky and Hastings reflect on social marketing in a period of social change.*European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1376-1398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-05-2013-0248

Dobbs, L., & Moore, C. (2002). Engaging communities in area-based regeneration: the role of participatory evaluation, *Policy Studies*, *23*(3/4), 157-171. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0144287022000045966

Dolan, P., Hallsworth, M., Halpern, D., King, D., &Vlaev, I. (2010). *MINDSPACE: Influencing Behaviour through Public Policy*. London: Cabinet Office/Institute for Government.

Domegan, C., Collins, K., Stead, M., McHugh, P., & Hughes, T. (2013). Value co-creation in social marketing: functional or fanciful? *Journal of Social Marketing, 3*(3), 239-256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jsocm-03-2013-0020

Donovan, R.J. (2000). Understanding the social determinants of health, *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *6*(3), 55-57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15245004.2000.9961120

Donovan, R. (2011). Social marketing's myth understandings. *Journal of Social Marketing, 1*(1), 8-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111104392

Eden, C.,& Ackermann, F. (1998). *Making Strategy, The Journey of Strategic Management*. London: SAGE Publications.

Enz, C.A. (2002). Trapped on the dark side of smoking bans.*Cornell Hotel and RestaurantAdministration Quarterly, 43*(2), 3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0010-8804(02)80025-8

Erkus-Ozturk H., &Eraydin, A. (2010). Environmental governance for sustainable tourism development: collaborative networks and organisation building in the Antalya tourism region. *Tourism Management*, *31*(1), 113–124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.002

Farquar, J.W., Fortmann, S.P., Maccoby, N., Haskell, W.L., Williams, P.T., Flora, J.A., Taylor, C.B., Brown, B.W. (jr.), Solomon, D.S., &Hulley, S.B. (1985). The Stanford five-city projects: design and methods. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 122*(August), 323-324.

French, J. (2011), Why nudging is not enough.*Journal of Social Marketing*, *1*(2), 154-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111141896

French, J.,& Blair-Stevens, C. (2010). *Improving Lives Together*. London: Westminster City Council.

Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. USA: Pitman Publishing.

Golan, M.,& Crow, S. (2004). Parents are key players in the prevention and treatment of weight-related problems. *Nutrition reviews*, *62*(1), 39-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-4887.2004.tb00005.x

Gordon, R. (2011). Critical social marketing: Definition, application and domain. *Journal of Social Marketing 1*(2), 82-99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111141850

Gordon,R.G. (2012). Rethinking and retooling the social marketing mix, *Australasian Marketing Journal*, *20*(2), 122-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2011.10.005

Gordon, R. (2013). Unlocking the potential of upstream social marketing.*European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1525-1547. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-09-2011-0523

Gordon, R., Moodie, C., Eadie, D., & Hastings, G. (2010). Critical social marketing - the impact of alcohol marketing on youth drinking: qualitative findings. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *15,* 265-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.388

Grier, S.,& Bryant, C. (2005). Social marketing in public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26,* 310-339.

Hamilton, K.L. (2007). Making sense of consumer disadvantage.In *Critical Marketing: Defining the Field.* M. Saren, P. Maclaran, C. Goulding, R. Elliott, A. Shankar & M. Catterall, (Eds), Oxford: Elsevier.

Halpern, D., Bates, C., Mulgan, G., Aldridge, S., Beales, G., &Heathfield, A. (2004).*Personal Responsibility and Changing Behaviour: The State of its Knowledge and its Implications for Public Policy*. London: Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office.

Harris, M., Hutchison, R., & Cairns, B. (2005). Community-wide planning for faith-based service provision: practical, policy and conceptual challenges. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *34*(1), 88-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0899764004269305

Hassan, L.M., Walsh, G.,Shiu, E.M.K., Hastings, G., & Harris, F. (2007). Modeling persuasion in social advertising: a study of responsible thinking in antismoking promotion in eight eastern EU (European Union) member states.*Journal of Advertising*, *36*(2), 15-31. http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/joa0091-3367360201

Hastings, G. (2007). *Social Marketing: Why Should the Devil Have All the Best Tunes*? Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hastings, G., & Domegan, C. (2014).*Social Marketing: From Tunes to Symphonies*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hastings, G. (2011). Letter to Editor – Impact of alcohol marketing on youth drinking. *Alcohol and Alcoholism, 46*(4), 506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agr070

Hastings, G. (2012).*The Marketing Matrix: How the Corporation Gets Its Power, and How We Can Reclaim It*. London: Routledge.

Hastings, G. (2013). Marketing as if people mattered. In Dibb, S. & Carrigan, M. (Eds.) Social marketing transformed - Kotler, Polonsky and Hastings reflect on social marketing in a period of social change. *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1388-1393. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-05-2013-0248

Hastings, G, Anderson, S., Cooke, E., & Gordon, R. (2005). Alcohol marketing and young people's drinking: a review of the research. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 26*(3), 296-311.

Hastings, G., & Angus, K. (2011). When is social marketing not social marketing? *Journal of Social Marketing, 1*(1), 45-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111104428

Hastings, G., & Donovan, R.J. (2002). International initiatives: introduction and overview. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *8*(1), 2-4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15245000212544

Hastings, G., & Saren, M. (2003a). Introduction to special issue on social marketing. *Marketing Theory*, *3*(3), 291-292. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147059310333007

Hastings, G., & Saren, M. (2003b). The critical contribution of social marketing: theory and application. *Marketing Theory*, *3*(3), 305-322. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147059310333005

Hawkins, J., Bulmer, S., & Eagle, L. (2010). Evidence of IMC in social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing,1*(3),228-239. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111170722

Hill, R. (2001). The marketing concept and health promotion: a survey and analysis of recent 'health promotion' literature. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 7*(1), 29-53.

Hoek, J.,& Jones, S.C. (2011). Regulation, public health and social marketing: a behaviour change trinity. *Journal of Social Marketing*, *1*(1), 32-44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761111104419

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *19*, 173-202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173

Jamal, T.B. (2004). Virtue ethics and sustainable tourism pedagogy: phronesis, principles and practice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *12*(6), 530–545. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669580408667252

Jamal, T.B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning.*Annals of Tourism Research,22*(1), 186–204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383

Knott, D., Muers, S., & Aldridge, S. (2007). *Achieving Culture Change: A Policy Framework*. London: Prime Minister's Policy Unit.

Kotler, P. (2013). My adventures with social marketing. In Dibb, S. &Carrigan, M. (Eds.) Social marketing transformed - Kotler, Polonsky and Hastings reflect on social marketing in a period of social change. *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1378-1383. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-05-2013-0248

Kotler, P.,& Lee, N.R. (2007). *Social Marketing: Influencing Behaviors for Good.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kotler, P.,& Levy, S.J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing.*Journal of Marketing*, *33*(1), 10-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1248740

Kotler, P.,& Roberto, E. (1989).*Social Marketing: Strategies for Changing Public Behavior.* New York: The Free Press.

Kotler, P.,& Zaltman, G. (1971). Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing*, *35*(3), 3-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1249783

Laczniack, G.R., Lusch, R.F., & Murphy, P.E. (1979). Social marketing: its ethical dimensions. *Journal of Marketing, 43*(2), 29-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1250739

Lazer, W.,& Kelly, E.J. (Eds.) (1973).*Social Marketing: Perspectives and Viewpoints.*Homewood Ill: Richard D. Irwin.

Leiringer, R., & Schweber, L. (2010). Managing multiple markets: big firms and PFI.*Building Research and Information,38*(2), 131–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09613210903027147

Lindridge, L., MacAskill, S., Gnich, W., Eadie, W., &Holme, I., (2013). Applying an ecological model to social marketing communications, *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1399-1420. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-10-2011-0561

Luck, D. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing – too far.*Journal of Marketing*, *33*, 53-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1248482

Macomber, J.D. (2013). Building sustainable cities. *Harvard Business Review*, *July-August*, 40-50.

MacFadyen, L., Stead, M., & Hastings, G. (2003). Social marketing. In M.J. Baker (Ed.), *The Marketing Book*, 5th Edition. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

MacNaughton, P., &Gillan, E. (2011). *Re-thinking Alcohol Licensing*. Scottish Health Action on Alcohol Problems, Alcohol Focus Scotland.

McDermott, L., Stead, M., & Hastings, G. (2005). What is and what is not social marketing: the challenge of reviewing the evidence, *Journal of Marketing Management*, *21*(5-6), 545-553. http://dx.doi.org/10.1362/0267257054307408

McKenzie-Mohr, D. (2000). Promoting sustainable behaviour: an introduction to community-based social marketing. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*(3) 543-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00183

Meier, P.S., Brennan, A., & Purshouse, R. (2010). Policy options for alcohol price regulation: the importance of modelling population heterogeneity. *Addiction*, *105*(3),383-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02721.x

Mitchell, R.K.,Agle, B.R.,& Wood, D.J. (1997).Towards a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*(4), 853–886. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/259247

Moore, S., Perham, N., & Shepherd, J. (2006). A multi-agency community-based intervention to reduce excessive drinking in Cardiff city centre: findings from night time surveys. *Alcohol Insight Number 36: Alcohol Research UK*, accessed 9.12.13 at: http://alcoholresearchuk.org/alcohol-insights/a-multi-agency-community-based-intervention-to-reduce-excessive-drinking-in-cardiff-city-centre-findings-from-night-time-surveys/.

Moraes, C.,Carrigan, M., &Leek, S. (2010). Reducing plastic bag consumption: a community approach to social marketing.In *European Conference of the Association of Consumer Research*.Royal Holloway, University of London.

Moseley, A., & Stoker, G. (2012). Nudging citizens? Prospects and pitfalls confronting a new heuristic.*Resources, Conservation and Recycling*.*79*(October), 4-10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.04.008

Paton, R., Ali, H.,& Taylor, S.L. (2009). Government support for faith-based organizations: the case of a development programme for faith leaders. *Public Money and Management*, *29*(6), 363-370. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540960903378209

Peattie, S.,&Peattie, K. (2003). Ready to fly solo?Reducing social marketing's dependence on commercial marketing theory.*Marketing Theory*, *3*(3), 365-385. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147059310333006

Pettigrew, S.,& M. Pescud (2012). Improving parents' child-feeding practices: a social marketing challenge. *Journal of Social Marketing*, *2*(1), 8-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761211203229

Polonsky, M. (2013).Three social marketing questions.In Dibb, S. &Carrigan, M. (Eds.) Social marketing transformed - Kotler, Polonsky and Hastings reflect on social marketing in a period of social change. *European Journal of Marketing*, *47*(9), 1378-1383. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ejm-05-2013-0248

Polonsky, M.J., Carlson, L., & Fry, M-L. (2003). The harm chain. A public policy development and stakeholder perspective.*Marketing Theory, 3*(3), 345-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147059310333003

Prochaska, J.O.,& DiClemente, C.C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51(*3), 390-395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.51.3.390

Raine, K.D. (2010). Addressing poor nutrition to promote heart health: moving upstream.*The Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, *26*(C), 21C. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0828-282x(10)71078-3

Rangun, V.K.,& Karim, S. (1991).*Teaching Note: Focusing the Concept of Social Marketing.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School.

Resnicow, K., Campbell, M.K., Carr, C., McCarty, F., Wang, T., Periasamy, S., Rahotep, S., Doyle, C., Williams, A., &Stables, G. (2004). Body and soul. A dietary intervention conducted through African-American churches. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *27*(2), 97-105.

Roderick, L. (2013). Real-time marketing: eight ways to make real-time marketing work for you, *The Marketer,* available at: http://www.themarketer.co.uk/how-to/tips-and-guides/8-ways-to-make-real-time-marketing-work-for-you/.

Rosenstock, I. (1990). The health belief model: explaining health behaviour through expectancies. In *Health Behavior and Health Education*, K. Glanz, F.M. Lewis, & B.K. Rimer (Eds). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 370-86.

Russell-Bennett, R., Wood, M., &Previte, J. (2013). Fresh ideas: services thinking for social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing*, *3*(3), 223-238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jsocm-02-2013-0017

Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (Eds.) (2009).*A Dictionary of Sociology* (3rd rev. ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sellen, A.,&Whittaker, S. (2010). Beyond total capture: a constructive critique of lifelogging. *Communications of the ACM*, *53*(5), 70-77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1735223.1735243

Spotswood, F., French, J., Tapp, A., & Stead, M. (2010). Some reasonable but uncomfortable questions about social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing, 2*(3), 163-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/20426761211265168

Stritt, S. B. (2008). Estimating the value of the social services provided by faith-based organizations in the United States. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *37*(4), 730-742. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0899764008321802

Tan, W. Cater-Stel, A.,&Toleman, M. (2009). Implementing IT service management: a case study focussing on critical success factors. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *50*(2), 1–12. http://web.tuke.sk/fei-cit/sarnovsky/RIP/zadania/Tan.pdf

Tapp, A.& Spotswood, F. (2013). From the 4 Ps to COM-SM: reconfiguring the social marketing mix. *Journal of Social Marketing, 3*(3), 206-222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jsocm-01-2013-0011

Thaler, R.H, &Sunstein, C.R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness.* New Haven: Yale University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/choice.46-0977

Thomas, M. (1999).Commentary, in *Rethinking Marketing*, Brownlie D.,Saren, M.,Wensley, R., & Whittington, R. (Eds). London: Sage.

Vargo, S.L., &Lusch,R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing.*Journal of Marketing, 68*(January), 1-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036

Vernon, J. Essex, S. Pinder, D.,&Curry, K. (2005).Collaborative policymaking.Local sustainable projects.*Annals of Tourism Research*, *32*(2), 325–345. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.06.005

Voyce, M. (2003). The market and social welfare in Australia: the creation of an "enterprise theology". *Journal of Law and Religion*, *19*(2), 397-425. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3649180

Wallack, L. (1990). Media advocacy: Promoting health through mass communication. In *Health Behavior and Health Education*, K. Glanz, F.M. Lewis, & B.K. Rimer (Eds). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 370-86.

Watt, R.G., Dowler E., Hardy, R., Kelly, Y., McGlone, P., Molloy, B., Tull, K.I., & Wiggins, M. (2007). Promoting recommended infant feeding practices in a low-income-sample randomised control trial of a peer-support intervention.*Proceedings of the nutrition society*, *66*, 23A-23A. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/isrctn55500035

Wells, W.D. (1997). Comment on social marketing: are we fiddling while Rome burns? *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*(2), 197-201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0602_05

Wiebe, G.D. (1951-1952). Merchandising commodities and citizenship on television. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 15*: 679-691. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/266353

Zaidi, Q., Govindji, A., & Ali, H.A. (2008).*Social Cooking Project*.Report commissioned by Food Standards Agency*,* London: Food Standards Agency.