PGDM / PGDM (IB), 2017-19

Social Marketing

DM-537 / IB - 510

Trimester – V, End-Term Examination: December, 2018

Time allowed: 2 Hrs and 30 Min

Max Marks: 50

Roll No: _____

Instruction: Students are required to write Roll No. on every page of the question paper, writing anything except the Roll No will be treated as Unfair Means. In case of rough work please use answer sheet.

Sections	No. of Questions to attempt	Marks	Marks
A	3 out of 5 (Long Questions)	10 Marks each	3*10 = 30
B	Compulsory Case Study	20 Marks	20
		Total Marks	**50**

Section A (Answer any 3 Questions)

Q1. What is "stages of change theory"? Discuss with suitable example. What are the limitations of this theory?

Q2. What is 'Positive Deviance' approach to social change? Discuss the steps involved in it and its application with two suitable examples.

Q3. Discuss the various steps involved in systematic planning process in social marketing with relevant example.

Q4. Who are upstream, mid stream and down stream audience in social marketing? Discuss why it is important to focus on upstream audience in social marketing.

Q5. Discuss 'TARPARE" model and its applicability in choosing right target segments in Social Marketing

Section B

Read the case "A marketing strategy to review the effects of food promotion to children" and answer the following questions.

Q1. What prompted Food Standards Agency (FSA) to commission Institute for Social Marketing (ISM) to conduct review of existing research? (5)

Q2. Critically review the process adopted by ISM and the findings of its research (10)

Q3. What was the impact of ISM research results on Food Advertising Unit (FAU) and public policy? (5)

CASE STUDY 4

A marketing strategy to review the effects of food promotion to children

Laura McDermott, Martine Stead and Gerard Hastings

1. Introduction

In 2002, the UK Government's Food Standards Agency (FSA) commissioned the Institute for Social Marketing (ISM) to conduct a review of existing research on the effects of food promotion on the dietary choices of children (Hastings *et al.*, 2003). The review has had a significant impact on public policy, underpinning the introduction of tighter regulations on the marketing of energy dense – so-called 'junk'– foods to children. This case summarizes the key research findings and policy implications resulting from the review.

2. Problem definition

Young people's dietary patterns are causing concern in the UK. The National Diet and Nutrition Survey conducted in 2000 reported that a vast majority of 4- to 18-year olds consume more than the recommended amount of saturated fat, sugar and salt (Food Standards Agency, 2000). The Chief Medical Officer's report confirms that, between 1996 and 2001, the proportion of overweight children between six and 15 years increased by 7% and obesity rates increased by 3.5% (Department of Health, 2003).

Questions were raised about the causes of these trends. One obvious answer was that individual behaviour – people eating too much and doing too little – was to blame. On the other hand, a broader situation analysis threw up the possibility that the commercial promotion of energy dense foods (such as burgers and fried chicken) was at least partly responsible.

However, there was a lack of evidence on the existence, nature and extent of any effect food promotion might be having on children's food knowledge, preferences and behaviour. As a result, many conflicting

views were being expressed by the different stakeholders, including the food and advertising industries, consumer/health advocates and public health advisors, about what the Government should do.

A review of the evidence was therefore commissioned.

3. Stakeholder analysis

Stakeholder needs and benefits regarding the review are shown in Table CS4.1.

Table CS4.1 Stakeholder needs and benefits

Stakeholder	Needs	Benefits from the ISM review	Potential role in the FSA review
Politicians	• Approve appropriate policy options. • Fund effective programmes.	• Context to legislate food promotion policies.	• Accept or refute Regulators recommendations. • Provide resources to institutions (e.g. schools) for food and nutrition education.
Regulators	• Recommend, develop and advise on policies. • Governed by laws, political realities, public sentiments, budgets, licensing, etc.	• Research evidence for the effects of food promotion on children.	• Recommend, develop and advise on food promotion policies.
Food and advertising industries	• Produce and advertise food products for society. • Commercial objectives.	• Balanced perspective on industry's role in children's dietary habits.	• Key players in the childhood obesity solution. • Successfully shift children from unhealthy to healthier eating.
NGOs/consumer advocates	• Lobby, persuade, or direct action. • Non-commercial objectives.	• Support legislative action against commercial promotion of food to children.	• Lobby, persuade or direct action for food promotion policies.
Public health professionals	• Develop and evaluate health programming.	• Guide childhood obesity programme planning.	• Programme planning to prevent and reduce childhood obesity. • Evaluation of childhood obesity programming.

4. Who, What, How?

The key stakeholder group was the Government, which had the ultimate responsibility to protect its citizenry. Its need was for incontrovertible evidence on the role, if any, of food promotion in the obesity epidemic. Specifically they needed a rigorous and thorough review of the evidence base.

5. Aims and objectives

A team of independent academics, led by ISM, was commissioned to examine current research evidence on:

(a) The extent and nature of food promotion to children.
(b) The effect, if any, that food promotion has on children's food knowledge, preferences and behaviour.

6. Formulation of strategy

The vital need was for rigorous and reliable results, so *systematic review* procedures were employed. These are borrowed from medical science, where challenging, consensual decisions about a contested evidence base have to be made on a regular basis, and great care is taken to ensure particular treatments are safe and effective, and that every possible source of evidence is identified and rigorously evaluated. The search methods and evaluation process also incorporate a detailed protocol to allow easy replication and review of key conclusions. In addition, the work was exposed to regular peer review.

The Systematic Review identified 30 000 potentially relevant papers, one hundred of which were deemed reliable, valid and hence capable of shedding light on the issue.

7. Findings

This first UK systematic review of the research literature found:

- *There is a lot of food advertising to children.* Food, more than any other product, is promoted to children, with the exception of toys during Christmas.
- *The advertised diet is less healthy than the recommended one.* Television, the principal medium for food promotion, mostly supports the 'big five' (pre-sugared breakfast cereals, soft drinks, confectionery, savoury snacks and fast food).

- *Children enjoy and engage with food promotion*. Fun and fantasy or taste, versus health and nutrition themes are used to promote the advertised diet to children.
- *Food promotion is having an effect*. Food promotion is affecting the food children express a preference for, buy and ask their parents to buy. Weaker evidence also suggests that food promotion impacts children's long-term diet and health.
- *The effect is independent of other factors and operates at both a brand and category level*. Advertising can shift children's preferences not just between brands, but also food categories (e.g. chocolate biscuits and crisps versus apples).

These findings were actively disseminated by the research team in academic outlets, but also at practitioner conferences and in the general media. As a result there was wide discussion of the research, which fed public debate about the issue.

8. Outcomes

Following the release of these results, the study was immediately put to the test. The Food Advertising Unit of the Advertising Association (FAU) commissioned both a rival review, which argued that commercial promotion of foods does *not* influence children (Young, 2003), and a critique of the FSA review (Paliwoda and Crawford, 2003).

The FSA assembled a seminar of leading academics under the chairmanship of Professor Nicholas Mackintosh of Cambridge University to discuss the conflicting assessments. The limited coverage of the FAU review was noted, as well as its contradiction of a review conducted by the same author in 1996 and its rejection of virtually all social science research as either too artificial (experimental studies) or too little control (observational studies) (Food Standards Agency, 2003a). It also rejected the critique (Food Standards Agency, 2003b). It was concluded that the FSA review provided sufficient evidence concerning a link between food promotion and children's food knowledge, preferences and behaviours.

But the sterner test was whether the review was considered robust enough by the Government for them to act. The answer is yes; at the end of 2006 its regulatory authority, Ofcom, proposed detailed proposals for significantly curtailing television advertising of energy dense foods to children (Ofcom, 2006). Other media sectors have agreed to follow suit.

The rigour and quality of the systematic review was critical to this outcome. Perhaps more importantly, from a social marketing perspective, it has also changed behaviour.

The authors would like to acknowledge the other members of the team who worked on the ISM-led review: Mike Rayner at the University of Oxford, Martin Caraher at City University London, Christine Godfrey at the University of York and Maria Piacentini at Lancaster University.