Value creation and destruction in social marketing services: a review and research agenda

Author Details

Author 1:   Nadia Zainuddin

                      Faculty of Business

                      University of Wollongong

                      Wollongong, New South Wales

                      Australia

Author 2:   Ross Gordon

                      QUT Business School

                      Queensland University of Technology

                      Brisbane, Queensland

                      Australia

Corresponding author: Dr Nadia Zainuddin

Corresponding Author's Email: nadiaz@uow.edu.au

Biographical Details (if applicable):

Nadia Zainuddin is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Wollongong in NSW, Australia. She is a specialist in social and behaviour change research, using services marketing and social marketing theories and frameworks in addition to other approaches, to influence individuals, communities, structures and societies to bring about positive social change. She is most well-known for her work in the area of value creation and destruction in social marketing and social change, examining how academics, managers, and organisations can create, communicate, and deliver value to citizens in order to facilitate desirable actions that provide positive individual as well as societal outcomes. She is also a mixed methodologist, drawing from a variety of qualitative and quantitative research techniques.

Ross Gordon is a Professor at Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane. He is also President of the Australian Association of Social Marketing (AASM). Ross is an interdisciplinary social change activist with degree qualifications in marketing, public policy, and politics and history. His work focuses on social issues and social change, through a critical, reflexive and multi-perspective lens. His discipline expertise lies in social marketing, consumer cultures, and critical marketing teaching and research. He works across various social change topic areas including energy efficiency, environmental sustainability, alcohol and alcohol marketing, gambling, tobacco control, mental health, and workplace bullying. He is also interested in critiques of neoliberalism and related social activism.

Value creation and destruction in social marketing services: a review and research agenda

Structured Abstract

Purpose: This paper aims to provide a review of the extant literature on value creation and destruction in social marketing services for social change, for the purposes of developing a research agenda for future research in this area. Creating value in social marketing services is now identified as a key focus for social marketing (Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2009; Domegan *et al*., 2013), yet work in this area is nascent and conceptual, methodological, and empirical work is needed to advance the research agenda (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013; 2016).

Design/methodology/approach: To help shape the future of research on value in social marketing services, this paper appraises the contributions of the current research literature, and identifies gaps in current knowledge. A systematic literature review was conducted, following the PRISMA protocol for conducting and reporting systematic reviews (Moher et al., 2009). The review covers the areas of value creation in social marketing, value destruction in social marketing, dimensions of value in social marketing, and from value-in-exchange, to value-in-use, to value-in-behaviour in social change.

Findings: A research agenda for further work in this area is provided within the themes of: 1. conceptual development, 2. broadening ontological, epistemological, and methodological foundations, 3. research contexts, and 4. measuring and evaluating value in social marketing services. Within each of these themes, a series of research questions are provided to guide further work in the four identified themes.

Originality/value: This paper is the first to offer a review of the extant literature on value creation and destruction in social marketing and social marketing services, and offer a research agenda for future work in this area. This paper contributes to services marketing and

the development of service thinking as key component of social marketing, and the role that value creation plays in this (Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2013).

Keywords: value creation, value destruction, social marketing services, social change, systematic literature review, research agenda

Article Classification: Conceptual paper

Introduction

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive review of the extant research literature on value in social marketing services and present a research agenda for scholarly work in this area. In doing so, our paper seeks to contribute to the development of service thinking in social marketing, the role of value in social marketing and services marketing, and to the increasing focus in service research on health, well-being, and behaviour and social change for social good. For the purposes of this paper, social marketing is defined as an approach that, "seeks to develop and integrate marketing concepts with other approaches to influence behaviours that benefit individuals and communities for the greater social good" (iSMA, AASM, ESMA, 2013).

The services marketing field has produced an abundance of value research studies, primarily oriented around understanding the value creation processes in service (Grönroos and Ravald, 2011), as well as the roles, activities, and contributions of relevant actors/stakeholders within service experiences (e.g. McColl-Kennedy *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, it can be argued that value and service research are inextricably linked, as services marketing research has driven much of the conceptual and empirical development in the value research field over the last fifteen years. Value can be defined "as the regard that something is held to deserve, the importance, worth, or usefulness of something" (Oxford English Dictionary, 2013) and is universally recognised as a core tenant of marketing, featuring prominently in contemporary marketing and consumer research (see AMA, 2013).

While a significant body of research has demonstrated the importance of value in commercial marketing, social marketers have highlighted the relevance, applicability, and importance of value to behaviour and social change issues (French and Gordon, 2020; Hastings and

Domegan, 2018). The applicability of value for social marketing was first considered in the 1970s, with Rothschild (1979) arguing that all marketing is centred on exchanges of value, even in non-business contexts. He argued that the cost-benefit analysis for social issues involves the consideration of nonmonetary costs, such as time, inconvenience, and psychic cost (Rothschild, 1979), weighted against the individual and social benefits of engaging in socially beneficial behaviours, such as military enlistment, safe driving, and voting. Building on this notion, others have argued that in order to incentivise individuals into action, it is necessary to provide them with a value proposition (Dann, 2008). This is particularly important in social marketing, where many of the desired behaviours for social change may be considered undesirable (Zainuddin, Tam, and McCosker, 2016). Therefore, providing value to social marketing target consumers can assist in their evaluations that the benefits outweigh the costs associated with behaviour change (Zainuddin *et al*., 2016).

The most prominent way in which the concept of value has permeated social marketing is through social marketing service research (Zainuddin, Russell-Bennett, and Previte, 2013). Services are often an integral component of social marketing programmes, for example, cancer screening, smoking cessation, and mobile mental health services (Gordon, Zainuddin, and Magee, 2016). Yet the use of service thinking in social marketing is nascent (Russell-Bennett, Wood, and Previte, 2013; Gordon *et al.*, 2016). A convergence of service thinking, and social marketing can be observed through thought developments in both fields (see Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2019).

Service researchers recognise the need to expand service thinking beyond a commercial orientation (Gordon *et al*., 2016), resulting in a growing focus on transformative services aimed at improving consumer and societal welfare (Ostrom *et al*., 2010). This has resulted in

the Transformative Service Research (TSR) stream (Rosenbaum *et al.*, 2011), which focusses on achieving well-being outcomes through service at both the individual and community level (Anderson *et al.*, 2013). While TSR solely focuses on how services produce pro-social outcomes, social marketing focuses more globally on how marketing principles and practices, including the use of services, bring about behaviour and social change to facilitate social good. Therefore, despite some alignment between TSR and social marketing, research on service thinking and the role of value in the latter has developed somewhat independently (see Fisk *et al.*, 2014; Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2019).

Scholars such as Vargo and Lusch (2004) have long since identified that value is a core focus for service thinking, design, and delivery. Therefore, successfully utilising service thinking and delivering effective services in the social marketing domain necessitates a focus on creating, communicating, and delivering value. Indeed, social marketing research has identified that creating value in social marketing services creates positive social outcomes including satisfaction, positive attitudes, behavioural intentions, and actual behaviour with respect to using and reusing social marketing services (Chell and Mortimer, 2014; Zainuddin *et al.*, 2013; 2016). This demonstrates the importance of value for sustaining behaviour change (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2016), which aligns with an orientation of facilitating social good. As social marketers ascertain, the creation of personal, social, and societal value in itself is a social good and therefore strongly aligns with the purposes of social marketing (French and Gordon, 2020; Gordon *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, creating value in social marketing services is a critical focal point for work in the area. Social marketers have identified that while there is a burgeoning research literature on value in social marketing, the conceptual and empirical knowledge base is not yet well understood and mapped out (French and Gordon, 2020). We

address this gap by providing a review of the research literature on value in social marketing services, and presenting a research agenda for future work.

Creating value in social marketing services is now identified as a key focus for social marketing (Domegan *et al*., 2013), yet work in this area is nascent and conceptual, and methodological, and empirical work is needed to advance the research agenda (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013; 2016). To help shape the future of research on value in social marketing services, this paper provides an appraisal of what the current research literature has contributed, identifies gaps in current knowledge, and sets out a series of research questions regarding the ontological, epistemological, methodological, and contextual focus that is needed to shape future research. This effort contributes to services marketing and the development of service thinking as key component of social marketing, and the role that value creation plays in this (Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2013).

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. First, this paper presents the systematic literature review research methods utilised for the identification and selection of literature included in our review. It then reviews and interprets the extant literature on value in social marketing services, and considers the contributions to knowledge made by this corpus of research, and identify some important gaps in our understanding. A series of research questions focusing on ontology, epistemology, methodology, and contexts that offer a research agenda for scholarly work in this area is then presented. Our hope is to encourage services marketing and social marketing scholars to take on this research agenda and help address gaps in current knowledge and increase our understanding of value in social marketing services. The paper then finishes by offering some concluding remarks regarding value in social marketing services.

Methods

To identify the relevant literature on value in social marketing services a systematic literature review was conducted. Systematic literature reviews offer a way to provide a comprehensive overview of a field of study or topic that minimises bias by following a rigorous and transparent process for searching, identifying, screening for relevance, and reviewing published and unpublished literature (Gough, Oliver, and Thomas, 2017). Our review followed the PRISMA protocol for conducting and reporting systematic reviews (Moher *et al.*, 2009). The systematic literature review involved searching three leading databases Scopus, Web of Science, and Business Source Complete to identify published articles on value in social marketing services. The following search terms were used to identify academic peer-reviewed articles published in the English language only, from 2000 to 2019 inclusive, using Boolean logic (AND/OR/NOT): "social marketing", "value", "value creation", "value co-creation", "value cocreation", "value destruction", "value co-destruction", and "value codestruction". The exclusion criteria included literature about personal values, which is distinct from consumer perceived value, as well as literature about the value chain, price-related literature, and where social marketing refers to social media.

References were identified, and the titles and abstracts of relevant database hits were then screened by two researchers to identify potentially relevant articles. Full-text articles were then screened for relevance by the two researchers and duplicates were removed. Inter-coding reliability checks were carried out with each researcher cross checking and coding a random sample of 10% of the coding decisions of the other researcher, to determine the level of interrater agreement. The interrater reliability was calculated as an estimate for the accuracy of the inclusion process. The intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) was rICC = 0.7, with a

standard error of measurement of 2.08. Under the interpretation of Fleis (1986), this is defined as good. Figure one presents a flowchart for our search strategy.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

Results

Our search strategy yielded a total of 50 publications. The researchers then read, discussed, analysed and interpreted the key ideas, concepts, arguments, and/or empirical research findings presented in these papers by following an iterative process of discussion, critical reflection, interpretation, and representation. In the following sections, we present a discursive review of the key ideas, themes, and contributions that emerge from the literature. We organise our review of the literature on value in social marketing services according to four key themes: (1) value creation, (2) value destruction, (3) dimensions of value, and (4) value perspectives.

Value creation in social marketing

According to Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) value creation is a process in which an organisation and consumers interact at various stages of consumption in order to create value by co-creating a good or service. Value creation acknowledges the involvement of multiple stakeholders in the marketing process, and their need to work collaboratively (Sheth and Uslay, 2007), distinguishing it from the traditional exchange paradigm in marketing.

The value creation paradigm aligns with contemporary thought in social marketing, which has broadened its original focus on individual (i.e. micro) level behaviour change, to include a focus on wider, external factors at the meso (i.e. community and service) and macro (i.e.

systemic and holistic) levels of influence on social issues and on pro-social outcomes (French and Gordon, 2020). This suggests that value creation in social marketing should be examined across all levels of influence. However, the extant empirical work examining value creation in social marketing largely concerns social marketing services, representing a focus at the meso-level of influence (Luca, Hibbert, and McDonald, 2016; Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2013). This identifies a gap in the current body of knowledge on value creation in social marketing, in the context of other levels of influence. In response, some scholars have offered conceptual considerations for how value can be examined across all levels of influence and society (e.g. McHugh, Domegan, and Duane, 2018).

Value creation in social marketing through the delivery of services, as a key component of social change management, was first introduced by Russell-Bennet, Previte, and Zainuddin (2009). They argue that there was limited use of value creation as an approach to social change management in government, despite being one of the most successful competitive strategies in commercial marketing (Ravald and Grönroos, 1996). The relevance of value creation as a social change management tool in government services emerged in recognition that many commercial marketing practices are translatable for use in social marketing (Wood, 2008). The major contribution offered by Russell-Bennet *et al.* (2009) was the conceptual development of an experiential value creation process model for government social marketing services. Their model identified the various influencers on the creation of functional, emotional, social, and altruistic value, and how value created results in important marketing outcomes for social change management (i.e. satisfaction with service use, behavioural intentions to engage with the service again, sustained behaviour change in the long-term) (Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2009).

Subsequent studies in social marketing services have since sought to unpack the nature and mechanics of value creation. Zainuddin *et al*. (2013) adapted the ideas set forth by Russell-Bennett *et al*. (2009), by refining the value creation process model for social marketing, and empirically testing this model amongst users of a social marketing service, government-provided cancer screening. This empirically-validated model was the first to identify the inputs required for value creation in social marketing, which actor/stakeholders were responsible for providing each input, and how they led to the creation of functional and emotional value (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013). The model also demonstrated a pathway from value to satisfaction with the service experience (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013), providing additional empirical support for the value-satisfaction link (Kotler and Levy, 1969). Finally, their model also demonstrated that satisfaction led to behavioural intentions to use the service again. A key contribution of this study was the development of a value creation process model that social marketing services can use and adapt in order to create value for their service users in order to achieve their aims of socially desirable behaviours (i.e. continued service use). It also offers a diagnostic tool to better understand and evaluate different operational areas within the service organisation, in order to maintain high level service delivery.

Further studies have investigated the applicability of value creation and service thinking in social marketing. Conceptual work has identified the challenges of applying value creation and service thinking in social marketing, offering suggestions for how this can be done critically and adapted suitably (Domegan *et al*., 2013; French, Russell-Bennett, and Mulcahy, 2017; Luca, Hibbert, and McDonald, 2015; Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2013). Based on a Europe-wide ocean literacy programme, McHugh *et al*., (2018) have also discussed and identified some of key stakeholders that should be considered with respect to value creation in social marketing, across all levels of society such as incumbents, challengers, and

regulating agencies. By identifying stakeholders beyond service users and service providers, they offer a meaningful extension to the initial insight offered by Zainuddin *et al.* (2013) on how value creation in social marketing occurs, offering greater applicability to broader, and larger-scale social programmes.

Empirical studies on value creation in social marketing services have largely sought to uncover the different types of value sought in a variety of behaviour and social change contexts. This research suggests that people seek different types of value in different contexts and that the influence of value on outcomes can vary considerably. For example, a bowel screening survey study suggests that both functional and emotional value exert a similar level of influence on satisfaction for Australian screeners (Zainuddin *et al*., 2016). In contrast, emotional value was the strongest predictor of behavioural intentions to donate blood (Chell and Mortimer, 2014). Given that blood donation is commonly considered to be an archetypal altruistic act (Chell and Mortimer, 2014), it is surprising that the influence of altruistic value was much lower in comparison. These studies demonstrate that people seek different types of value in different social change contexts, and that across contexts, the influence of value on outcomes can differ greatly. Empirical studies also identify the different resource contributions required to produce various value types across contexts. These can be referred to as sources of value (Smith and Colgate, 2007), which influence the different value dimensions perceived in different social contexts (Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2009; Zainuddin, Previte, and Russell-Bennett, 2011). Resource contributions from traditional face-to-face service providers, including technical and interpersonal expertise, as well as resource contributions from the service user, including motivational direction and stress tolerance, have been identified as being critical to successful creation of value (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013). However, for self-services, greater resource contributions are required from the self-service

users (e.g. role clarity) in order to successfully self-perform the service and create value (Zainuddin *et al*., 2016). Whilst these examples suggest that different resource contributions are required in different social contexts, it is not yet known what other sources of value exist across the breadth of social contexts (Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2009). Further research exploring different sources of value is therefore recommended (Zainuddin *et al*., 2016).

Value destruction in social marketing

In addition to understanding value creation in social marketing services, it is also important to consider how value is or may be destroyed in behaviour and social change contexts. Plé and Chumpitaz Cáceres (2010, p. 431) define value destruction as an "interactional process between service systems that results in a decline in at least one of the systems' well-being". However, work on value destruction is less well developed and previously the concept had only been referred to implicitly (Plé and Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010). For example, Woodruff and Flint (2006) identified that devaluation can occur in consumers' service experiences. However, they did not explore the dynamics of devaluation explicitly.

More recent empirical studies have begun looking at value destruction in more detail. For example, Echeverri and Skålén (2010) suggest that incongruence between service providers' and service users' applications of interaction practices (informing, greeting, delivering, charging, helping) leads to value destruction. In contrast, Smith (2013) described value destruction as emanating from a series of resource losses, such as material, time, and self-esteem, as well as failure to realise the expected value from participants' service experiences. While Echeverri and Skålén's study focussed on practice, Smith's (which was not service-specific) focussed on process, demonstrating the different approaches that value destruction research can take.

In social marketing, value destruction was first tacitly mentioned by Hastings and Domegan (2014) in relation to the experience of young, Type 1 diabetics attending their annual check-up service. They observed that "waiting rooms that smell like operation theatres, no free Wi-Fi access, and no privacy for people with distressing symptoms" are reflective of conditions that lead to value destruction and cause diabetics to miss their annual health checks (Hastings and Domegan, 2014, p.278). Such observations imply that factors leading to value destruction for social marketing target consumers can be left unchecked, undermining the goals and objectives of social change programmes. This example identifies issues that can be easily rectified, yet are not, and are instead needlessly destroying value. By understanding the factors that lead to value destruction, social marketing services can put actions into place to monitor these factors to ensure they maintain appropriate standards to safeguard value creation efforts and minimise value destruction. However, Hastings and Domegan (2014) do not explicitly identify their observations as an example of value destruction.

The first to specifically discuss and reflect on the nature of value destruction in social marketing were French and Gordon (2015). They argue that value creation and avoiding value destruction are crucial for social marketing, and that the concept of value destruction needs to be further explored. They warned that the implications of value destruction in social marketing are arguably more serious than in commercial marketing, as value destruction can lead to consumers to stop using lifeline health and social services.

Zainuddin, Previte, and Russell-Bennett (2015) referred to value destruction explicitly in a qualitative study considering the influence of third parties on Australian women targeted for breast cancer screening. They note that "stakeholders create opportunities for value co-

creation or co-destruction" (Zainuddin *et al*., 2015, p. 161), basing their observations on the role that doctors, the media, celebrities affected by breast cancer (specifically, Australian celebrities such as Kylie Minogue), and social networks play in impacting the value derived from breast screening services for individuals. However, they offer limited insights on the dynamics of value destruction processes in social marketing, leaving many important questions unanswered. For example, what are the factors that lead to value destruction? What is the impact of value destruction on social marketing services, behaviour change, and social change? These questions are important for social marketing services scholars to address, if behaviour and social change is truly to be supported through the facilitation of value creation, and the minimisation of value destruction.

Recent, social marketing studies are primarily focussed on understanding and empirically examining value destruction. For instance, a longitudinal netnography by Zainuddin, Tam, and Dent (2017) observed general physical and mental health behaviours (e.g. exercising, meditation) amongst students in NSW Australia, seeking to maintain them across twelve weeks. They identified behaviour maintenance barriers (physical and mental discomfort; time and effort) that destroyed functional, emotional, and epistemic value, and behaviour maintenance facilitators (engagement, support, and interaction; creative and strategic idea sharing; personal enjoyment and rewarding experiences) that created functional, emotional, social, and community value (Zainuddin *et al*., 2017). Their study focussed on the performance of behaviour, rather than on the use of service, and therefore was framed through a consumer-dominant value creation perspective (Anker *et al*., 2015). The consumer-dominant value creation perspective is reflective of provider-independent consumer agency, where value is created through patterns of individual behaviour in order to meet subjective needs (Anker *et al*., 2015). A key contribution from the work by Zainuddin *et al.* (2017) is

the identification that value creation and destruction can occur concurrently, and that they inter-relate. For example, although a lack of time and high levels of effort can destroy functional value in attempts to maintain healthy lifestyles, encouragement and support from peers can create social and community value, that helps to negate the value destroying effects. This also suggests that members of peer groups, such as the online community investigated, have the potential to create and destroy value for each other. However, given the exploratory nature of their work, further quantitative research is needed to test the inter-relationships between the value creation and value destruction processes, as well as peer-to-peer interactions and how they impact on these processes.

In contrast, Leo and Zainuddin (2017) undertook a qualitative exploratory service study in WA Australia utilising interviews and focus groups. They suggest that in social marketing support services like counselling, or suicide helplines, value destruction occurs through one of two processes: incongruent resource application, or misuse of firm resources. They also identified three outcomes of value destruction: reduced service use, termination, and strategic behavioural actions (Leo and Zainuddin, 2017). Their results offer two key contributions to social marketing knowledge on value destruction. First, the process of destruction occurs in multiple ways, even within the same context. Second, the outcomes of value destruction reflect a spectrum of severity from termination of service use, which represents the most severe outcome of value destruction as an individual no longer receives any support for their problem. However, strategic behavioural actions suggest that through contributing additional resources, the impact of value destruction can be minimised, or even overcome (Leo and Zainuddin, 2017). This finding lends support to French and Gordon's (2015) argument that implications of value destruction in social marketing are more serious than in commercial marketing.

However, despite the benefits of the insight generated by this initial work, Leo and Zainuddin's (2017) findings offer only exploratory insights, which they caution cannot be generalised across all social marketing service contexts. Combined with their small sample size, they acknowledge that further research is required, specifically efforts utlisising larger sample sizes, operationalised across other social marketing service contexts, and using research methods other than the qualitative approaches undertaken in their work (Leo and Zainuddin, 2017).

Dimensions of Value

A further important consideration regarding value in social marketing services concerns the different dimensions of value that consumers perceive. Experiential value is a multi-dimensional construct consisting of "several interrelated attributes or dimensions that form a holistic representation of a complex phenomenon" (Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007, p. 431). While there are many value dimensions identified in the extant literature, the most common and salient dimensions in social marketing are functional, economic, emotional, social value, ecological, and societal value (Table 1).

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

Functional value

Functional value refers to the utility, performance, and functionality of an act or experience (Sheth, Newman, and Gross, 1991; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001; Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2009). It is extrinsically motivated (a means to an end), and for the benefit of the self rather than others. For example, qualitative and quantitative studies on cancer screening services among Australian men and women found that service users believe cancer screening is effective in

their primary function of detecting signs of cancer, generating functional value (Zainuddin *et al*., 2011; 2013; 2016). Similarly, a Swedish mixed-methods study found that people who reduced their meat consumption perceived that this improved their diet, leading to better health outcomes, again reflecting the generation of functional value (Jutbring, 2017). These studies suggest functional value represents a fundamental value type that is relevant across social contexts, as they relate to a core utility generated from engaging with a consumption experience. Therefore, social marketers should seek to identify the core purpose of their social offering, in order to ensure that this is consistently fulfilled.

Economic value

Economic value is also known as price value (Gordon *et al*., 2018), and refers to the utility derived from a product or experience based on its ability to reduce perceived short term and longer term costs (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). It is reflective of the economic paradigm that views value as a result of a cost-benefit analysis (Zeithaml, 1988) and implies a monetary exchange (Russell-Bennett *et al*., 2009). However, its relevance to social marketing has been somewhat dismissed by Russell-Bennett *et al*. (2009) who argue that because monetary exchanges rarely feature in social marketing, a value dimension reflective of monetary exchanges is not relevant. Indeed, although the ideas put forward by Russell-Bennett *et al*. (2009) were framed within the context of free social marketing services, we argue that economic value is relevant to social marketing for two reasons. First, as economic value is also known as price value, then guided by the social price concept (Hastings and Domegan, 2014), it includes both monetary and nonmonetary costs, both relevant in many social change contexts. Second, guided by Rothschild's (1979) argument that marketing, including social marketing, is centred on exchanges of value and that individuals act out of self-interest, then its exchange-oriented nature is also relevant to social marketing. Indeed, studies have

demonstrated that economic value can be created by providing services for free (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013), making access to services more convenient (Zainuddin *et al*., 2011), or by helping citizens save money (Gordon *et al*., 2018), incentivising engagement with social marketing services and behaviours.

Emotional value

Emotional value is associated with various positive (e.g. confidence, pleasure) and negative (e.g. worry, fear) affective states (Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo, 2006) that are sought or avoided through people's actions or inactions. It is intrinsically motivated (an end in itself) and self-oriented (Holbrook, 2006). Utility in emotional value is derived from the feelings or affective states generated or aroused by the consumption experience (Sheth *et al*., 1991; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). For example, individuals appear to be strongly motivated by emotional value in relation to health issues – people use health services to alleviate worry over their health (Zainuddin *et al*., 2011; 2013; 2016) or engage in healthful behaviours because it makes them feel good that they have done something positive for themselves (Jutbring, 2017). This is experienced in addition to the functional value derived from the physical benefits to one's body. However, qualitative research on promoting energy efficiency among older low-income consumers in Australia suggests that people are not strongly motivated by emotional value to engage in energy efficient behaviours, as they did not perceive engaging in these behaviours to be overly emotional in nature (Butler *et al*., 2016). These insights clearly demonstrate that social marketers should seek to examine the nature of value across multiple social change contexts, as their ability to motivate individuals to engage can vary.

Social value

Social value refers to a focus on affecting other people as a means to achieving a desired goal such as status or personal influence (Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2009). Its utility is acquired through an association with specific social groups (Sheth *et al.*, 1991), or the identification of one's self as an opinion leader (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2011). Social value is extrinsically motivated and directed at others (Holbrook, 2006). Existing social marketing studies suggest that unlike functional and emotional value, the salience of social value in some aspects of social marketing, such as the context of health service use is much lower. For example, although some women use breast cancer screening services to set a good example to others, therefore deriving social value (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2011), it does not influence their satisfaction with the service experience and only weakly influences behavioural intentions to use the service again (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2016). Similarly, energy conservation research has found that consumers do not perceive high levels of social value from using energy efficiently in their homes, except when entertaining guests (Butler *et al.*, 2016). This suggests that the relevance of social value increases in more conspicuous consumption situations. For example, a Swedish music festival announced the removal of meat from all menus one day before the event, forcing attendees to consume vegetarian food for the duration of the multi-day affair (Jutbring, 2017). A research study conducted with the festival goers found that they perceived the sharing of this experience with others as a symbolic activity creating social value through the development of an affinity for one another through this shared experience (Jutbring, 2017). Similarly, a netnography of members within an online community for people with inflammatory bowel disease suggests that high levels of social value were experienced through the sharing of members' stories and the support they were able to provide one another (Stewart Loane and Webster, 2017). These insights suggest that further research in group or conspicuous consumption contexts may yield interesting observations of how value can change across a variety of social contexts.

Ecological value

In more recent years, there has been a growing research focus on environmental behaviours in social marketing (see McKenzie-Mohr, 2011). Ecological value refers to the value that consumers derive from the perceived impacts on environmental and ecological issues and concerns (French and Gordon, 2015). For example, older low-income consumers in Australia were highly motivated to perform energy saving behaviours due to the ecological value this can generate (Butler *et al*., 2016). Further, a survey-based study of the same demographic found that ecological value had a significant effect on energy behaviour outcomes (Gordon *et al*., 2018). Indeed, given the growing climate crisis (UN, 2019), it is becoming more imperative to consider how stakeholders can be motivated to make changes to address climate change through offering an ecological value proposition. However, further research is needed to fully explore ecological value and how it is created and destroyed.

Societal value

Seeking to extend the concept of value in social marketing, French and Gordon (2015) propose an additional dimension of value – societal value that benefits society at large. They define societal value as "value in human endeavour for the benefit of society more broadly" – for example quitting smoking not only for personal health benefits but to help reduce the burden on health and service systems that are associated with smoking (French and Gordon, 2015, p. 168). French and Gordon (2015) acknowledge that there may be overlap between social and altruistic value. However, there is debate as to whether true altruism exists. Some scholars such as Rothschild (1999) argue that in marketing, it does not and that everyone acts out of self-interest. Contrastingly, others such as French and Gordon (2015) and Golpadas (2015) argue that people can be motivated by doing things for the greater good and that such

societal value is not currently recognised in existing marketing thought and therefore should be further conceptualised and empirically researched to inform social marketing theory and practice.

From value-in-exchange, to value-in-use, to value-in-behaviour in social change

The final area of focus regarding value in social marketing services covered here concerns the perspectives on how value is created. In social marketing services research, work in this area concentrates on three perspectives: value-in-exchange, value-in-use, and value-in-behaviour (Table 2).

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

Value-in-exchange

Value-in-exchange refers to value as something that is added to products in the production process and is captured in price at the point of exchange (Lusch, 2007). It is outcomes-oriented (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), taking an economic approach, adopting the cost-benefit evaluation to defining value (Zeithaml, 1988). Value-in-exchange also tends to be goods-based, which is incongruent with the intangible nature of ideas-based social marketing. However, as previously highlighted, many individuals in many social marketing contexts still engage in cost-benefit analyses reflective of value-in-exchange (Rothschild, 1979). They analyse the monetary (if any) as well as non-monetary costs against the monetary (if any) or non-monetary benefits of engaging in socially desirable behaviour. This is reflected in the concept of the social price, which refers to the sum of the monetary and non-monetary components of the social offering (Hastings and Domegan, 2014). Social marketers who have adopted social pricing as a strategy have relied on three different tactics: (1) increasing the monetary and non-monetary benefits for the desired behaviour, (2) decreasing the monetary and non-monetary costs for the desired behaviour, and (3) increasing monetary and non-

monetary costs for the competing behaviour (Hastings and Domegan, 2014). For example, a social marketing programme to encourage older low-income people in Australia to be energy efficient promoted the benefit of saving money on utility bills (Cooper *et al*., 2016). Another study from the US found that the low pricing of unhealthy foods (competition) can undermine consumers' efforts to choose healthier foods (desired behaviour) (Gertner *et al.*, 2016). While these examples demonstrate monetary exchanges in two different social issues, non-monetary exchange evaluations are equally important. For example, the convenience of accessing a health service through widespread availability of service centres, extended operating hours, and easy parking can help overcome perceived non-monetary costs such as effort (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2011). These strategies are reflective of a value-in-exchange approach to social marketing and demonstrate how the exchange concept remains relevant in social change issues, even though the dominant value creation perspective has largely moved away from the value-in-exchange perspective.

Therefore, care should be taken not to dismiss this approach. However, given the wide breadth of social change issues, it is reasonable to argue that a value-in-exchange approach may be limited or ineffective in some contexts. This is particularly applicable in contexts where individuals prioritise the quality of their experiences over the actual outcomes of those experiences. For example, many smokers enjoy the ritual of smoking and continue to do so despite being fully informed of its negative health implications/outcomes (Folan *et al.*, 2017). Hence, an alternate approach, such as value-in-use, may be more appropriate.

Value-in-use

Value-in-use is a process-oriented approach, proposing that value is realised during the consumption experience, rather than embedded within goods or services (Sandström *et al*.,

2008). Value is determined from the application of operant resources (Vargo and Lusch, 2004) and by the service user (Grönroos, 2011). Here, firms can only offer value propositions (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). As value-in-use reflects consumers' experiences of an offering (Luca *et al*., 2015), social marketing studies in service use reflect the adoption of this approach. Examples include blood donation (Chell and Mortimer, 2014), cancer screening (Zainuddin *et al*., 2013; 2016), and support services (Leo and Zainuddin, 2017). Adopting the value-in-use approach through social marketing service research reflects a midstream approach to social change (Luca *et al*., 2015). This signals a shift away from the downstream, individual-oriented approach to behaviour change that dominated the field for many of its early years (Gordon, 2013).

Yet, despite this development, this service orientation of value in social marketing through value-in-use has its limitations. It can only be applied in contexts where there is service delivery, but not all social marketing programmes involve service delivery or service delivery may only be one facet of a programme. For example, Zainuddin *et al*. (2016) identified that that are many social marketing contexts where individuals perform behaviours independently, or with limited or no direct interaction with a service organisation – such as remembering to bring reusable grocery bags when shopping instead of using plastic bags, which are harmful for the environment. Engaging in this conservation behaviour does not require service use on the part of the individual, yet it is expected that individuals continue to perform this behaviour because they perceive value from these behaviours. Therefore, the value-in-use approach is ill-placed to explore this phenomenon. This brings forth the concept of value-in-behaviour.

Value-in-behaviour

Value-in-behaviour is a concept that first emerged in the social marketing literature, and concerns an approach to consider participant value that is, or is not, realised through the performance of (pro-social) behaviour(s) (French and Gordon, 2015; Gordon *et al*., 2018; Zainuddin and Gordon, 2014). This concept reflects a behaviour orientation towards value in social marketing, building and expanding upon value-in-use. On this line, social marketing scholars have begun to consider that in addition to perceiving value in consuming, using, and experiencing goods and services, people may also perceive value in the behaviours they perform (e.g. using reusable grocery shopping bags) (Butler *et al*., 2016; French and Gordon, 2015; Gordon *et al*., 2018; Zainuddin and Gordon, 2014).. Zainuddin and Gordon (2014) argued that existing value conceptualisations were unable to capture the full breadth of individuals' experiences engaging in positive social behaviours, resulting in the proposed concept of value-in-behaviour. Gordon *et al*. (2018) note that whilst value-in-behaviour is not a direct measure of actual behaviour, it can aid understanding of consumer motivations towards performing specific behaviours.

Only two empirical studies in social marketing have so far examined the concept of value-in-behaviour. In the context of energy efficiency, consumers perceived value towards the performance of pro-social behaviours to conserve energy (Butler *et al*., 2016; Gordon *et al*., 2018), which had a significant influence on their attitudes and behaviours (Gordon *et al*., 2018). This tells social marketers that they should aim to create, communicate, and deliver consumer perceived value towards the performance of pro-social behaviours, as well as through exchanges, and the use of services.

Value in social marketing services: A future research agenda

As illustrated in our review of the extant literature, while there have been several useful contributions to the knowledge base regarding value creation and destruction in social marketing services, there remains a lot to be done. Here, we offer some suggestions on a future research agenda with the objective of encouraging researchers to contribute, supplement, and strengthen the stream of critical work in the area, and to present some ideas from which they may draw upon to inform their work. We outline our suggested research agenda according to the following themes: 1. conceptual development, 2. broadening ontological, epistemological, and methodological foundations, 3. research contexts, and 4. measuring and evaluating value in social marketing services. Within each of these themes, we offer a number of research questions intended to guide further work in this area.

Conceptual development

Our first area of focus for future research on value creation and destruction in social marketing services concerns conceptual development. The development of new theories, concepts, and constructs is arguably the first and most important part of the development of research agendas as conceptualising ideas helps to identify, clarify, map, and set out a clear agenda for the empirical testing of our knowledge and understanding regarding a specific domain. While social marketers working from a service thinking orientation have already contributed to conceptual development regarding value creation and destruction in social marketing services, there are some identifiable areas requiring further work.

First, concerning value creation there are some critical conceptual questions that require clarification. There are issues with terminology and nomenclature that require some consideration. For instance, the term "value creation" is often used interchangeably with "value co-creation" or simply "co-creation", although it is argued that they are distinct

(Zainuddin *et al*., 2016). The use of the prefix "co-" implies a togetherness and an association with a partner, creating the perception that value creation occurs as a result of a dyadic partnership. Although the term predominantly used in the services marketing literature is "value co-creation", the term "value creation" is also used. Further, non-service marketers working in social marketing or social change may not be familiar with this convention and that this term is intended to refer to interactions between actors, replacing the previous convention of between providers and users. Furthermore, given that the term "co-creation" is intended to refer to interactions between actors, it is ill-placed to encapsulate value creating activities that do not involve interactions between actors, which is common in many social change programmes. For example, individuals can still derive value from sorting rubbish into the appropriate recycling and non-recycling bins, or from performing a health self-check such as breast self-examinations, or from the act of switching off appliances at the wall to be more energy efficient. Therefore, future work could aim to clarify these issues of terminology and nomenclature, guided by the following questions:

- *What is the most appropriate terminology when examining value in social marketing? Is it "value creation", "value co-creation", or "co-creation"? Is it "value destruction", "value co-destruction", or "co-destruction"?*

We argue that the term "value creation" is sufficient in communicating and encompassing the creation of value by one, two, or more stakeholders. This aligns more closely with the complex and multifaceted nature of social marketing, acknowledging that various societal stakeholders seek different types of value, whilst capturing the inter-connected nature of how these values can be created as well as their inter-dependencies. Similarly, we argue for the use of the term "value destruction". We suggest that the terms "co-creation" and "co-

destruction" be used more specifically in contexts where dyadic creation or destruction of value occurs in social marketing.

Conceptual questions regarding value creation include considering whether value self-creation exists in social marketing service contexts and what factors influence such processes. Grönroos and Voima (2013, p136) propose that value creation requires important self-activities that exist in the "customer sphere" and that do not overlap with the "provider sphere" (p. 136). As such, social marketers have argued for the acknowledgment of the concept of value self-creation, defined as a "value creation process whereby the consumer assumes primary responsibility for creating value in a consumption experience, occurring independent to the provider" (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2016; p. 587). Indeed, many services include self-service elements, such as bowel screening, which requires an individual (rather than a service provider) to assume responsibility for taking samples of bowel motions. Therefore, a further important question on this line is under what auspices value self-creation is preferable to co-creation in social marketing services. Future research in this area could be guided by the following questions:

- *What factors influence processes of value self-creation in social marketing service contexts?*
- *Under what auspices is value self-creation preferable to value co-creation in social marketing services?*

Another conceptual idea put forward concerns the idea of consumer-to-consumer (C2C) value creation (Stewart Loane, Webster, and D'Alessandro, 2015; Stewart Loane and Webster, 2017; Zainuddin *et al*., 2017). Many services, such as health and fitness services

(see Parkinson *et al.*, 2017) leverage on the social support benefits provided by consumption communities in order to improve consumption experiences. However, there is limited research in social marketing that examines co-consumers in group consumption settings and their impact on value creation, and the focus of these studies exist predominantly in online, rather than offline communities (e.g. Stewart Loane *et al.*, 2015; Parkinson *et al.*, 2017; Zainuddin *et al.*, 2016). Calls for further research to fully understand the nature of value experienced as an outcome of a collective experience are warranted, and its processes require explication. Therefore, the following research questions are offered in relation to the concept of C2C value creation to guide further research in this area:

- *How should C2C value creation be defined?*
- *What are the opportunities and threats from taking a C2C value creation approach as compared to direct intervention on social issues?*
- *When should a C2C approach be used in social marketing programmes?*

Another important question is what social marketing service actors should do when consumers do not wish to, are unable to, or cannot be reached to foster engagement and interaction in value creation processes. While a huge amount of attention currently focuses on consumers who have in some way engaged in value creation through social marketing services, there is very little said about consumers who are not engaged or who have disengaged from such services. Yet, this is an important problem that concerns organisations. For example Diabetes Agencies often struggle to deal with diabetics who have never attended or who stop attending their screening and management support services. These patients often experience greater health problems and put a greater strain on the health system as a result. Another example is the National Health Service (NHS), which is intended to serve one and

all. However, there are segments of the population that sit outside the normal realms of society, such as the homeless, who organisations like the NHS may be unable to identify and reach. Nevertheless, these are important and vulnerable segments of the population that are in need of support and intervention. Therefore, a research question that could guide further work in this area is:

- *How do social marketing services serve consumers who are unwilling or unable to engage in value co-creation?*

With respect to value destruction in social marketing services there remains limited understanding of the causes, effects, and processes of this phenomenon, or how it can be avoided, and if and how it can be reversed. Given that value is a multi-dimensional construct, it can be created and destroyed simultaneously (see Zainuddin *et al.*, 2017). However, the existing, limited research on value destruction in social marketing services assumes that value creation and destruction occur separately, and according to linear processes (see Leo and Zainuddin, 2017; Zainuddin *et al.*, 2013). Existing studies also limit their focus on the interactions between service user and service provider, and do not account for actors outside of this user-provider dyad and their role and influence on value creation and destruction. For example, when using a blood donation service, functional value may be destroyed if a blood donor is unable to find parking easily at the blood service carpark, and if the donor is told off by service staff for being late for their appointment this can destroy emotional value. However, societal value may still be created for the blood donor from knowing that their donation will contribute towards ensuring a healthy blood supply for the community. Social value may also be created when a donor's contribution is recognised by significant others.

Therefore, given the multi-dimensional nature of the value construct (Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007), that it can be created and destroyed simultaneously (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2017), and the multitude of stakeholders that exist across all levels of society who can influence the creation and destruction of value (McHugh *et al.*, 2018), we argue that value creation and destruction do not exist on a continuum. Rather, we argue that it is a three-dimensional (3D) process where it can be created and destroyed at the same time, influenced by a variety of multiple actor/stakeholders. However, work is needed to develop these ideas further. Therefore the following research questions are offered to guide further work in this area:

- *How does the simultaneous creation and destruction of value occur in social marketing service experiences?*
- *How do the value creation and destruction processes influence one another?*
- *How do the various actor/stakeholders influence the value creation and destruction processes in a social marketing service experience?*

Emergent work has also suggested that opportunities exist for value recovery or recreation after it has been destroyed in service experiences, making it possible to overcome the effects of value destruction (Laud *et al.*, 2019; Zainuddin and Leo, 2019). Specifically, Zainuddin and Leo (2019) propose that value re-creation can be achieved through the re-aligning of the service experience in order to stay on the path of continued service use. They argue that if no such recovery or recreation efforts are exerted, then subsequent value destroying incidences are likely to occur, eventually leading to termination of service use. Laud et al. (2019) further identify that restoration of well-being lost as a consequence of value destruction is possible, and can be achieved through actors' reaction coping processes supported by social,

commercial or regulatory support resources. However, these ideas are in their nascent form, and future research is needed to explore this concept further, guided by the following research questions:

- *How should value re-creation be defined?*
- *How can value re-creation be enacted, in order to overcome value destruction in social marketing service experiences?*

Further conceptual development is also needed regarding the proposed construct of societal value (French and Gordon, 2015). Currently, this is merely an idea with little in the way of explication or empirical evidence. The proposal that consumers could be motivated by value beyond their own self-interest but toward the benefit of society and the greater good flies in the face of established thinking offered by scholars such as Rothschild (1999). Yet, it has been suggested that consumers are motivated by societal interests (Golpadas, 2015; French and Gordon, 2015; Gordon *et al.*, 2018). For example, an Australian study found that women in Queensland believed that the maintenance of their good health through regular screening meant that they would not be a burden on the health system, therefore benefitting the community (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2011). Similarly in Malaysia, residents in Putrajaya perceived societal value in recycling because of concern for their children and future generations (Noorashikin *et al.*, 2018). However, a study on blood donation in Australia found that while donors were motivated to continue donating blood because of the desire to help others, emotional value was a stronger driver of donation intentions (Chell and Mortimer, 2014). Therefore, conceptual work is needed to explicitly map out what societal value is, and if and how it is distinct from aligned ideas such as ecological value or altruistic value. Further, conceptual work is needed to critically respond to the idea of self-interest, and explain how,

when and why societal value may exist and how it could be motivated and promoted by social marketing service actors.

- *How should societal value be defined?*
- *How is societal value different from ecological value and altruistic value?*
- *Which consumer segments are more likely to be motivated by societal interests and perceive societal value that is linked to pro-social behaviours?*

Lastly, work is needed to further develop the concept of value-in-behaviour (Gordon *et al*., 2018). Particularly, work that conceptualises the domain and parameters for value-in-behaviour in contrast to the other value perspectives would be welcomed. Such work could consider when in social marketing is a value-in-behaviour approach warranted versus trying to promote value-in-use – particularly when social marketing programmes are seeking to promote both the use of services *and* the performance of pro-social behaviours. One suggestion is that in certain social marketing contexts a multi-perspective approach may be necessary that considers value-in-exchange, value-in-use, and value-in-behaviour. For example, promoting good sexual health may involve encouraging people to identify value-in-exchange for purchasing and using goods such as condoms. It may also involve promoting value-in-use of sexual health screening services ensuring a good experience for users. But it may also involve communicating the value of performing pro-social behaviours such as always using contraception, or getting regular testing for STIs. As such, we offer the following question to guide further work in this area:

- *In what situations would social marketing programmes combine the different value perspectives (value-in-exchange, value-in-use, value-in-behaviour) to*

form a holistic approach? How would the different value perspectives be combined?

There is also limited understanding as to how each approach affects the others, how they interact, and how they impact outcomes. These are important considerations for social marketing programmes that seek to promote both the use of services *and* the performance of pro-social behaviours. This leads to the following questions to guide further work in this area:

- *How do the three value approaches (value-in-exchange, value-in-use, value-in-behaviour) interact? Do they mediate, or moderate each other? How do they influence outcomes?*

We suggest that path modelling would be a useful means to measure how each approach leads to outcomes, and as well as understand the interaction effects of these three approaches.

Broadening ontological, epistemological and methodological foundations

Another element of developing a future research agenda for value creation and destruction in social marketing services concerns the broadening of ontological, epistemological, and methodological foundations. Reviewing the extant literature illustrates that quantitative survey based research dominates, with some more limited use of well-established qualitative methods such as open-ended/narrative interviews and focus groups. This suggests that heretofore, research on value creation and destruction in social marketing services has followed a largely Parmenidean ontology of being that affirms a single, universal and quantifiable truth. The being ontology is associated with the use of positivist and post-positivist epistemology, and largely quantitative research methods. Yet, there are

opportunities to use innovative methods like cognitive neuroscience in relation to value in social marketing services. For example, social marketing research has started using EEG studies (see Gordon *et al.*, 2018) that could examine brain wave responses to the use of social marketing services, or elements of service delivery like waiting rooms, and promotional materials.

Social marketers have also identified that the very complexity of social problems requires a more fluid and pragmatic ontological, epistemological, and methodological perspective (French and Gordon, 2020). It follows that social marketing work does also often engage with the Heraclitean ontology of becoming that emphasises an ever changing and emerging world and no single universal truth but multiple interpretations of reality. The ontology of becoming is associated with interpretivist epistemology, and the use of qualitative and interpretive methods like ethnography found in the work of Consumer Culture Theory (CCT) scholarship (see Arnould and Thompson, 2005). Interpretive work that engages with CCT and uses methods like ethnography and visual methods could help add understanding regarding subjectivities and meanings relating to the use of social marketing services, or how various elements of the social practices of using services such as the body, materials, and spaces and place influence outcomes. For example, visual ethnography can provide a more nuanced understanding of how the body is affected by health service use, or to understand and capture the physical barriers, lack of access, and other factors relevant to mobility research, such as in the case of providing public transport services for driving retirees. Indeed, ethnography is one research approach that has largely been overlooked in service research, despite its unique strengths and ability to offer deeper insights to services (Keränen and Prior, 2019). As such, the following research question is offered to guide further research in this area:

- *What other research methods (e.g. neuroscience, ethnography) can help us understand social marketing services?*

Another ontological issue that is relevant in social marketing concerns critical theory and critical thinking, through the emergence of the critical social marketing paradigm (Gordon, 2011; 2018). Critical social marketing critiques the privatisation and neoliberalisation of public social marketing services, because it puts the profit motive ahead of serving the public and society (Golpadas, 2015; Gordon, 2019). There are tensions about whether commercial or public sectors should deliver social services, as it has been argued that the marketisation of such services leads to greater focus on commercial targets at the expense of social objectives (Davidson, 2018). For example, the introduction of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) by the Australian government has resulted in the inclusion of private service providers for the delivery of disability services. Yet, many services contracted out by government to private providers have complicated and sometimes contradictory aims (Cahill and Toner, 2018). For example, services seeking to promote equality for disadvantaged groups but also achieve efficiencies by providing services at the minimum possible cost. Further critical work in this area is needed and should consider the following questions:

- *Who should deliver social marketing services (state versus commercial sector)? How does this influence value creation?*
- *Who deserves to be served by social marketing services? What are the justifications for not serving particular consumer groups?*
- *What are the implications on funding, resources, longevity and the sustainability of social marketing services in relation to austerity politics and the privatisation of the state?*

Finally, much social marketing research is problem focused and takes a pragmatic ontological and epistemological approach (see Quine, 1960) and drawing on the use of mixed methods to respond to relevant research questions (French and Gordon, 2020). Therefore, future research on value creation and destruction in social marketing services combining multiple methods would be welcome and offer the ability to triangulate data to better understand phenomena.

- *How can multiple methods be effectively combined to better understand social marketing service experiences?*

Research contexts

Existing research on value creation and destruction in social marketing services largely focuses on health contexts (Zainuddin *et al*., 2016). However, research is starting to focus on other social marketing contexts like public transport (Echeverri and Skålén, 2010), energy efficiency (Gordon *et al*., 2018), and road and rail safety (Mulcahy, 2015). Research on other social marketing service contexts like care services, education, police, fire, social housing, and community development would be welcome to broaden the scope of knowledge. Furthermore, work that focuses on a broader range of consumer populations including children, disadvantaged groups, and migrants, and the concerns social marketing services in non-Western contexts is needed to broaden the knowledge base, particularly work in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We argue that work in these contexts are necessary as it cannot be assumed that theoretical frameworks are directly translatable across contexts (Hoek and Jones, 2010). As such, the following research question is offered to guide further research in non-Western contexts and/or amongst non-mainstream populations:

- *How can existing conceptualisations of value be appropriately translated across different social marketing service contexts, and across different consumer groups?*

Measuring and evaluating value

The existing empirical research measuring and evaluating value in social marketing has primarily drawn from value scale measures from the commercial marketing literature. Given that the roots of the value concept were founded on the marketing exchange concept, these value scale measures were originally developed from a commercial marketing, and goods-oriented perspectives. With the rise of service thinking and emergence of the experiential value concept as a core feature of SD-logic, newer value scale measures have been developed with a service orientation. These experiential value scales are more closely aligned with social marketing, especially when the service experience is a core component of a social change programme.

However social marketing is a complex domain that often involves a wide range of interactions and activities beyond exchange or service experiences. This means that extant value scale measures are not suitably designed to capture or reflect these complexities. For example, existing value scale measurement items from commercial marketing research are often adapted for use in social marketing contexts but do not always offer a good conceptual fit – especially when there is a focus on capturing value-in-behaviour. Accordingly, some social marketers have conducted limited scale development work. For example Gordon *et al.*, (2018) developed a new functional value measure with respect to energy conservation after finding existing scales unsuitable. However, further work is needed to develop a full suite of conceptually and empirically grounded scale items for measuring all the different dimensions

of value in social marketing: functional, economic, emotional, social, ecological, and societal. Further work is also needed to measure value across the three different domains of value-in-exchange, value-in-use, and value-in-behaviour in social marketing. Such work could form the basis of a good PhD or post doctorate research project, and the following research question is offered to guide future work:

- *How can value be more effectively measured in social marketing and social marketing services?*

Conclusion

This paper has presented a review of value creation and destruction in social marketing services. In doing so we have offered definitions and clarifications regarding key concepts, and considered what the extant literature has contributed to knowledge and identified gaps that remain to be addressed. A research agenda on value creation and destruction in social marketing services is provided across four themes. Within each of these themes, we offer a number of research questions intended to guide further work in each area. We call on researchers and practitioners to think more broadly about these issues, and consider ways of moving forward in a collaborative manner, given the highly practical nature of social marketing service work. The suggestions in the research agenda are not intended to be definite, but hopefully chart some ideas for scholars to engage with in this important area.

References

AMA (2013), "American Marketing Association: Definition of Marketing", available at: https://www.ama.org/AboutAMA/Pages/Definition-of-Marketing.aspx (accessed 28 January 2019).

Anderson, L., Ostrom, A.L., Corus, C., Fisk, R.P., Gallan, A.S., Giraldo, M., Mende, M., Mulder, M., Rayburn, S.W., Rosenbaum, M.S., Shirahada, K. and Williams, J.D. (2013), "Transformative service research: an agenda for the future", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66, pp. 1203-1210.

Anker, T. B., Sparks, L., Moutinho, L., and Grönroos, C. (2015), "Consumer dominant value creation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 3-4, pp. 532–560.

Arnould, E.J. and Thompson, C.J. (2005), "Consumer culture theory (CCT): twenty years of research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 868-882.

Butler, K., Gordon, R., Roggeveen, K., Waitt, G., and Cooper, P. (2016), "Social marketing and value in behaviour? Perceived value of using energy efficiently among low income older citizens", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 144-168.

Cahill, D., and Toner, P. (2018), "Situating privatisation and economic reform," in Wrong way: How privatisation and economic reform backfired, Damien Cahill and Phillip Toner, Eds. Carlton, VIC: La Trobe University Press.

Chell, K., and Mortimer, G. (2014), "Investigating online recognition for blood donor retention: An experiential donor value approach", *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 143–163.

Cooper, P., Gordon, R., Waitt, G., Petkovic, D., Burroughs, N., Tibbs, M., Butler, K., Roggeveen, K., McDowell, C., Kokogiannakis, G., Ledo Gomis, L., Magee, C., (2016), EE3A: Pathways and Initiatives for Low-Income Older People to Manage Energy. Final Report. Department of Industry, Innovation and Science, Canberra.

Dann, S. (2008), "Adaption and adoption of the American Marketing Association (2007) definition for social marketing", *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. XIV No. 2, pp. 92-100.

Davidson, B. (2018), "The marketisation of aged care in Australia," in Wrong way: How privatisation and economic reform backfired, Damien Cahill and Phillip Toner, Eds. Carlton, VIC: La Trobe University Press.

Domegan, C., Collins, K., Stead, M., McHugh, P., and Hughes, T. (2013), "Value co-creation in social marketing: functional or fanciful?", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 239-256.

Echeverri, P. and Skålén, P. (2011), "Co-creation and co-destruction: a practice-theory based study of interactive value formation", Marketing Theory, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 351-373.

Fisk, R., Rosenbaum, M., Zainuddin, N., and Russell-Bennett, R. (2014). Social marketing and transformative service research: Exploring the similarities and differences of two research approaches. AMA SERVSIG Conference, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Fleiss, J. (1986), *The design and analysis of clinical experiments,* Wiley, New York.

Folan, P., Spatarella, A., Jacobsen, D. and Farber, H.J. (2017), "Why do I smoke and why do I keep smoking?", *American Journal of Respiratory Critical Care Medicine*, Vol. 196, p. 7-8.

French, J. and Gordon, R. (2015), *Strategic Social Marketing*, Sage Publications, London.

French, J. and Gordon, R. (2020), *Strategic Social Marketing: for behaviour & social change*, 2nd Edition, Sage Publications, London.

French, J., Russell-Bennett, R. and Mulcahy, R. (2017), "Travelling alone or travelling far? Meso-level value co-creation by social marketing and for-profit organisations", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 280-296.

Gertner, D., Gertner, A.K., Vianna Araujo, D., Bahia, L., and Bouzas, I. (2016), "Calories and Cents: Customer Value and the Fight Against Obesity", *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 325-339.

Gordon, R. (2019), "Critical social marketing: reflections, introspections, and future directions", in The Routeledge Companion to Critical Marketing, by Tadajewski, M. (Ed), Routeledge.

Gordon, R., Dibb, S., Magee, C., Cooper, P., and Waitt, G. (2018), "Empirically testing the concept of value-in-behavior and its relevance for social marketing", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 82, pp. 56-67.

Gordon, R., Russell-Bennett, R. and Lefebvre, R.C. (2016), "Social marketing: the state of play and brokering the way forward", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 32 No. 11-12, pp. 1059-1082.

Gordon, R., Zainuddin, N. and Magee, C. (2016), "Unlocking the potential of branding in social marketing services: utilising brand personality and brand personality appeal", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 48 – 62.

Gough, D., Oliver, S. and Thomas, J. (2017), *An Introduction to Systematic Reviews,* 2nd Edition, Sage, London.

Grönroos, C., (2011), "Value co-creation in service logic: A critical analysis", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 279-301.

Grönroos, C., and Ravald, A. (2011), "Service as business logic: implications for value creation and marketing", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 5-22.

Grönroos, C., and Voima, P. (2013), "Critical service logic: Making sense of value creation and cocreation", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 133–150.

Hastings, G. and Domegan, C. (2018), *Social marketing: Rebels with a cause,* 3rd Edition, Routeledge, London.

Hastings, G. and Domegan, C. (2014), *Social Marketing: From Tunes to Symphonies,* 2nd Edition, Routeledge, London.

Hoek, J., and Jones, S. (2011), "Regulation, public health and social marketing: a behaviour change trinity", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 32-44.

Holbrook, M. B. (2006), "Consumption experience, customer value, and subjective personal introspection: An illustrative photographic essay", *Journal of Business Research,* Vol. 59, pp. 714-725.

iSMA, AASM, ESMA (2013), "Consensus Definition of Social Marketing", available at: http://www.i-socialmarketing.org/assets/social_marketing_definition.pdf (accessed 29 January 2019).

Jutbring, H. (2018), "Social marketing through a music festival: Value perceived by festival visitors who reduced meat consumption", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 237-256.

Keränen, J. and Prior, D. (2019), "Opportunities for ethnographic methodologies in B2B service research", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-04-2019-0159

Kotler, P., and Levy, S. K. (1969), "Broadening the Concept of Marketing", *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 33 No. January, pp. 10-15.

Laud, G., Bove, L., Ranaweera, C., Leo, W., Sweeney, J. and Smith, S. (2019), "Value co-destruction: a typology of resource misintegration manifestations", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 7, pp. 866-889.

Leo, C. and Zainuddin, N. (2017), "Exploring value destruction in social marketing services", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 405-422.

Luca, N., Hibbert, S. and McDonald, R. (2015), "Towards a service-dominant approach to social marketing", Marketing Theory, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 194-218.

Luca, N. R., Hibbert, S., and McDonald, R. (2016), "Midstream value creation in social marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 32 No. 11-12, pp. 1145-1173.

Lusch, R. F. (2007), "Marketing's evolving identity: defining our future", *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 261-268.

McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Vargo, S. L., Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., and Kasteren, Y. V. (2012), "Health care customer value cocreation practice styles", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 370-389.

McHugh, P., Domegan, C. and Duane, S. (2018), "Protocols for stakeholder participation in social marketing systems", *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 164-193.

McKenzie-Mohr, D. (2011), *Fostering sustainable behaviour: community-based social marketing*, New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island.

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., and Altman, D. G. (2009), "Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement", *Annals of internal medicine*, Vol. 151 No. 4, p. 264-269.

Mulcahy, R. F. (2015), *A game of balance and disguise: Examining experiential value and game attributes in social marketing m-games* (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).

Noorashikin, M.M., Ahmad, M., Mashitoh, Y., & Akmaliah, A. K. (2018). Ethical Consumer Perceived Value in Sustaining Recycling Behaviour. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 56, p. 01003). EDP Sciences.

Ostrom, A.L., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W., Burkhard, K.A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., Demirkan, H. and Rabinovich, E. (2010), "Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 4-36.

Parkinson, J., Schuster, L., Mulcahy, R., and Taiminen, H.M. (2017), "Online support for vulnerable consumers: A safe place?", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 4/5, pp. 412-422.

Peattie, K., and Peattie, S. (2003), "Ready to fly solo: reducing social marketing's reliance of commercial marketing theory", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 365-385.

Plé, L., and Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. C. (2010), "Not always co-creation: Introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 430–437.Prahalad, C. K., and Ramaswamy, V. (2004), "Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing,* Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 5-14.

Quine, W.V.O. (1960), *Word and object*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Ravald, A., and Grönroos, C. (1996), "The value concept and relationship marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 19-30.

Rosenbaum, M.S., Corus, C., Ostrom, A.L., Anderson, L., Fisk, R.P., Gallan, A.S., Giraldon, M., Mendes, M., Mulders, M., Rayburn, S.W., Shirahada, K. and Williams, J.D. (2011), "Conceptualization and aspirations of transformative service research", *Journal of Research for Consumers*, Vol. 19, pp. 1-6.

Rothschild, M.L. (1979), "Marketing communications in nonbusiness situations or why it's so hard to sell brotherhood like soap", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. Spring, pp.11-20.

Rothschild, M. L. (1999), "Carrots, Sticks, and Promises: A Conceptual Framework for the Management of Public Health and Social Issue Behaviours", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63 No. 4, pp. 24-37.

Russell-Bennett, R., Previte, J. and Zainuddin, N. (2009), "Conceptualising value creation for social change management", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 211-218.

Russell-Bennett, R., Wood, M. and Previte, J. (2013), "Fresh ideas: services thinking for social marketing", *Journal of Social Marketing*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 223-238.

Russell-Bennett, R., Fisk, R., Rosenbaum, M.S. and Zainuddin, N. (2019), "Commentary: transformative service research and social marketing – converging pathways to social change", *Journal of Services Marketing.*

Sánchez-Fernández, R., and Iniesta-Bonillo, M. Á. (2006), "Consumer perception of value: literature review and a new conceptual framework", *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Vol. 19, pp. 40.

Sandström, S., Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P. and Magnusson, P. (2008), "Value in use through service experience", Managing Service Quality, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 112-126.

Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., and Gross, B. L. (1991), "Why we buy what we buy: A theory of consumption values", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 159-170.

Sheth, J. N., and Uslay, C. (2007), "Implications of the Revised Definition of Marketing: From Exchange to Value Creation", *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing,* Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 302-307.

Smith, A.M. (2013), "The value co-destruction process: a customer resource perspective", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 47 Nos 11/12, pp. 1889-1909.

Smith, J. B., and Colgate, M. (2007), "Customer Value Creation: A Practical Framework", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice,* Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 7-23.

Stewart Loane, S., and Webster, C. M. (2017), "Social Capital and Consumer Value Co-Created Within an Online Health Community", *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 317-345.

Stewart Loane, S., Webster, C. M., and D'Alessandro, S. (2015), "Identifying consumer value co-created through social support within online health communities", *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 353-367.

Sweeney, J. C., and Soutar, G. N. (2001), "Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale", *Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 77, pp. 203-220.

UN (2019), "United Nations Climate Action Summit", available at:

https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/ (date accessed 27 September 2019).

Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2004), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing",

Journal of Marketing, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 1-17.Wood, M. (2008), "Applying commercial

marketing theory to social marketing: a tale of four Ps (and a B)", Social Marketing

Quarterly, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 76-85.

Woodruff, R.B. and Flint, D.J. (2006), "Marketing's service-dominant logic and customer

value", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing:

Dialog, Debate, and Directions,M.E. Sharpe, New York, NY, pp. 183-195.

Zainuddin, N. and Gordon, R. (2014). Social marketing, value, and behaviour – some

important considerations. International Social Marketing Conference, Melbourne Australia.

Zainuddin, N., Previte, J., and Russell-Bennett, R. (2011), "A social marketing approach to

value creation in a well-women's health service", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27

No. 3-4, pp. 361-385.

Zainuddin, N., Previte, J. and Russell-Bennett, R. (2015), "Exploring the influence of third

party sources of value in social change management", in French, J. and Gordon, R. (Eds),

Strategic Social Marketing, Sage Publications, London.

Zainuddin, N., Russell-Bennett, R., and Previte, J. (2013), "The value of health and

wellbeing: an empirical model of value creation in social marketing", *European Journal of

Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. 9, pp. 1504-1524.

Zainuddin, N*.,* Dent, K., and Tam, L. (2017), "Seek or destroy? Examining value creation

and destruction in social marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 33 No. 5-6, pp.

348-374.

Zainuddin, N., Tam, L., and McCosker, A. (2016), "Serving Yourself: Value self-creation in

health care service", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 586-600.

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988), "Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 No. July, pp. 2-22.

Figure 1 Flowchart