

## A comparative study of urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools against smoking

<sup>1</sup> Siddharth Kashyap, <sup>2</sup> Dr. Sadhana Mahajan

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Himachal Pradesh University Business School, Summer-Hill, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor (Retired), Himachal Pradesh University Business School, Summer-Hill, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

### Abstract

Several social marketing tools are being implemented to distract the teenagers from smoking in Shimla. The present research paper aims to identify the urban & rural teenager's perception about the impact of social marketing tools from the territory of Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. To serve the objective descriptive research design is used and primary data is collected from 500 respondents with the help of questionnaire. Data is analyzed with the help of frequency distribution and chi-square test. It has been concluded that perception of urban & rural teenagers significantly differ with respect to their Age & Type of Family.

**Keywords:** urban teenagers, rural teenagers, smoking, social marketing tools

### Introduction

Social marketing is the solicitation of philosophies and tools of marketing to make socially prerequisite goals which may concern prosperity of society as a whole relatively for profit or other executive goals and encompasses the approach, application and appliance of programmes intended to influence the capability of social philosophies and relating contemplations of product development, assessment, communication and market research. The basic objective of social marketing is to alter behaviour. There are a number of methodologies to affect such shift (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971) [12].

Kotler and Zaltman (1971) [12] initially demonstrated social marketing in an article depicting the application of showcasing beliefs and practices to shape up a social foundation or behaviour. It invalidated social communiqué as an arrangement for accomplishing social change by unifying into parsimoniously resolute ideas, like statistical measuring, item progression and the prearrangement of spurs (Fox & Kotler, 1980) [5].

The basic literature on social marketing effectiveness postulates that it has been effective in changing behaviours, especially in areas related to tobacco regulation, physical activity, etc. The union of various researches and analyses has specified that social marketing campaigns can change behaviour concomitant with health and act as implementer but the effects may often be trivial. Researchers have pointed out that although the effect might be negligible but the social marketing campaigns have been able to have considerable influence on population (Evans *et al.*, 2007).

Social marketing is known to have been virtually created by early seventies. This innovative marketing method was being regarded as to communicative technique for planned social change. The entire theory related to it was based on existing marketing principles which could be used to guide non-commercial areas. Thus, this new concept was defied because

it pronged away from prevailing marketing edifices and was seen by some as an aberration from the field of marketing (Luck, 1974).

Social marketing is concerned with two basic factors, customer presentation and exchange. Customer's presentation is the key section of a wide range of development, distinguishing it from offering (Kotler *et al.* 1996). In social marketing the change is based around customer, thereby the social advertiser attempts to build an association with the apprehensive target customers after some time and their data is examined at all stages in the change. Exchange on the other hand is concerned with satisfying needs (Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987) [8].

Lefebvre & Flora, (1988) [16] stated that social marketing can be distinguished on the basis of intangible products like concepts, approaches, and lifestyle changes. They stated that social marketing tries at impacting a definite segment through an assured medium, making them compliant towards a given idea or position (Ling *et al.*, 1992) [18]. Social marketing as theory or concept is concerned with sustaining the needs of target audiences in a way that benefit entire society. It can be related with a many social problems like wellbeing in terms of health, crime control, etc. thus benefiting the consumer (Andresen, 1995).

The inception of social marketing is known to have advanced in parallel with commercial marketing. In 1951, Wiebe poised the question about offering the brotherhood like soap. Philip Kotler, in later 60's used the term societal marketing in his book by which he inferred socially reliable marketing by organizations. In 1971 Kotler and Zaltman distributed the crucial article developing the term social marketing. In the concerned article they explained that there is a separation of marketing related practices that advertisers and general public can concede to achieve social perseverance as opposite to money related augmentation (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971) [12].

## Review of Literature

A study conducted during late 70's in India was about an inoculation programme was started with the objective of reducing the sickness and mortality due to vaccine preventable diseases. Immunization reporting stages in infants and pregnant women were escalating substantially. The Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) was launched in India to control six diseases: diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus, poliomyelitis, and typhoid and childhood tuberculosis. The intention was to cover mainstream of all infants. Consequently, the programme was universalized and renamed as Universal Immunization Programme (UIP) in 1985. Social marketing came out to be an effective medium in making the masses cognizant about the above stated diseases and cure (Shanker, 1991).

During the early 80's another experimental movement, assimilated child development services (ICDS) was initiated in Gujrat and Maharashtra. The goal of ICDS was to improve sustenance and health of offspring between the ages zero to six and to lay down footing for the child's suitable psychological, physical and social development. For this specialised social marketing firm, Manoff international inc. was involved along with a marketing study firm MODE (market operations design enquiry services). The foremost tenacity of the study was to categorize the part in which consciousness needed was to be formed and determine the way in which this would help the masses. The entire campaign was based on effective media procedure for conveying various messages (Querashi, 1996).

In a study conducted in Iowa, USA social marketing was seen as an actual behavioural alteration model for educating about public health issues. As per WIC Program initiative, a campaign by the name *Loving Support* was intended to increase breastfeeding among WIC contributors. The valuation of the programme established that as a consequence of social marketing with the breastfeeding rates were advanced among WIC contributors. In addition, women in the programme indicated that they were getting more sustenance from their loved ones or family along with prenatal health care providers. The entire campaign was based on active media movements that resulted in inclusive accomplishment (Gordon *et al.*, 2006).

In 2005, a social marketing inventiveness was started in Tallinn, Estonia by the name "*Noortekohvik*" (alcohol and tobacco free cafe initiative). The campaign was an origination of representatives from the Estonian Temperance Union and the Estonian Union for Child Welfare. It concerned allotting press announcements and systematising a range of measures, comprising a tobacco and alcohol free congregations for the youth at various well known cafes. It also concerned in showcasing social advertisement video clips which were for showcasing the undesirable influence of alcohol and tobacco usage. The inventiveness was able to diminish tobacco consumption and alcoholism among the youth to substantial extent and it steered and made the youth cognizant about the negatives of tobacco and alcohol addiction (DGHC, 2009).

UK being one of the leading countries for the progress of social marketing initiatives, with support from the UK government in indicating Health White Paper (Department of Health 2004), an internationally documented academic

research centre has ensued in increased capacity for research, funding and a practitioner skills base, more widely recognised definitions of principles and practice, and the development of professional standards in social marketing (Gordon & Moodie 2009).

The 'Smoking Not Our Future' movement was established by the Health Sponsorship Council and was launched in 2007. The target group was New Zealand youth aged 12-24 years. The goal of the campaign was to de-normalise tobacco use by snowballing negative discernments of the social consequences of smoking among young people. Over three phases, the movement reliably presented youth-oriented celebrities speaking about smoking, being smoke free and quitting smoking. A variety of media channels were used, with television advertisements, radio, magazines and bus shelters. The third phase of the campaign built on previous phases by joining de-normalisation and social condemnation communications with messages encouraging termination and the possessions of role modelling (Thorney & Marsh, 2010).

In another social marketing campaign named 'Florida Winds of Change' the importance was on universal precautionary approaches directed at the general public to thwart child maltreatment. The campaign was launched as part of the state and nationwide abuse prevention Month in the USA. The campaign connected to usual community based childcare programmes. Messages recognized for the campaign were engrossed on educating the consciousness about child development and related aspects. The campaign commenced a marketing methodology whereby situations and action steps regarding deterrence of child abuse and desertion were measured along with the public service announcements on radio's and TV's. Moreover, community led undertakings such as conversation on various public forums was a part of this movement (Falconer *et al.*, 2012).

## Research Gap

The teenage years are a period of great prospects for the young and fervent minds of any person. The same person may face many challenges and problems regarding numerous issues during this time frame. They may face situations where decisions taken by them turned out to be life changing. These decisions may pertain to violence, alcoholism, smoking or drug abuse, to name a few. In the present era, India along with the world is facing a whole lot of social issues. Among them 'teenage smoking' is one of the most burgeoning dilemma that has led thousands of young and evolving minds towards this rancorous habit of smoking at an early age. The major effects of this problem are irreversible and have resulted in unimaginable loss to society.

Although a lot of literature can be found in social marketing and its application for inducing behavioural change. Not much of the literature has been found to study the effect of schooling on teenager's perception about impact of social marketing tools related to smoking in Shimla. Social marketing is the procedure that identifies with showcasing methods of insight and strategies to make, interface, and convey an incentive so as to influence target group of audience practices that help society and in addition the objective populace (Kotler, Lee & Rothschild, 2006). It is the precise use of advertising together with different thoughts and systems to accomplish particular

behavioural finishes for social welfare (National Social Marketing Center, 2006).

Kotler and Lee (2008) characterize social marketing as the procedure that identifies with promoting principles and techniques to make and convey motivation measures, keeping in mind the end goal to impact target audience. Through this study an attempt has been made to study the effect of schooling on teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools related to smoking in Shimla.

**Objectives of the study**

The purposes of this research paper is to find out the moderating effect of demographics on teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools

**Research Hypothesis**

Following hypotheses have been tested in this research paper:-

H1: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of gender

H2: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of age

H3: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of schooling

H4: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural

teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of school

H5: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of family

H6: There would be a significant difference in urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of caste

**Research Methodology**

a) **Research Design:** To have a better understanding about the issue descriptive research design was used.

b) **Sample Design:** 250 urban & 250 rural teenagers were selected & interviewed for the completion of study.

c) **Research Instrument:** The data has been collected with the help of pre-tested self-administrated questionnaire. Impact of Social Marketing Tools was assessed by 13 items. The items were measured with the help of dichotomous scale having option of Yes & No

d) **Analysis:** The data collected was analyzed with the help of chi-square test.

**Analysis & Interpretations**

**1. Demographic Profile of Respondents**

The table 1 is presenting the demographic profile of respondents i.e. gender, age, schooling, type of school, type of family and caste of urban & rural teenagers.

**Table 1:** Demographic Profile of Respondents.

Particulars	Classification	Urban		Rural	
		N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Gender	Male	200	80.00	230	92.00
	Female	50	20.00	20	8.00
Age	13 to 16 Years	98	39.2	104	41.6
	17 to 19 Years	152	60.8	146	58.4
Schooling	Private	199	79.6	90	36
	Government	51	20.4	160	64
Type of School	Boys	42	16.8	39	15.6
	Girls	44	17.6	17	6.8
	Co-ed	164	65.6	194	77.6
Type of Family	Nuclear	182	72.8	132	52.8
	Joint	68	27.2	118	47.2
Caste	General	179	71.6	141	56.4
	SC	26	10.4	63	25.2
	ST	19	7.6	11	4.4
	OBC	11	4.4	6	2.4
	Other	15	6	29	11.6

**2. Comparison of Urban & Rural Teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools**

This section of the presents the Comparison of Urban & Rural Teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools in the following sub sections:-

**2.1 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of**

**gender**

The Chi-square test (table 2) indicated that there was no significant difference in the perception of male & female teenagers for impact of social marketing tools. Thus hypothesis H1, for significant difference in the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of gender is not accepted.

**Table 2:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of gender.

Gender								
Social Marketing Tool	Response	Male		Chi-Square	Response	Female		Chi-Square
		Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural	
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	450	525	0.21	Yes	120	45	0.63
	No	150	165		No	30	15	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	320	369	0.006	Yes	70	21	3.84
	No	80	91		No	30	19	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	636	764	1.89	Yes	194	66	3.03
	No	364	386		No	56	34	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	410	471	0.007	Yes	100	39	0.05
	No	190	219		No	50	21	

\*0.05 level of Significance, Tabulated Value = 3.841

**2.2 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of age**

The Chi-square test (table 3) indicated that there was significant difference in the perception about impact of social

marketing tools of urban & rural teenagers for both the age groups except for Social Marketing Tools of Media. Thus hypothesis H8.2, for significant difference in the perception about impact of social marketing tools of urban & rural teenagers on the basis of age was partially accepted.

**Table 3:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of age.

Age								
Social Marketing Tool	Response	13 to 16		Chi-Square	Response	17 to 19		Chi-Square
		Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural	
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	199	261	21.1*	Yes	371	309	14.34*
	No	95	51		No	85	129	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	104	159	24.28*	Yes	286	231	29.02*
	No	92	49		No	18	61	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	360	394	0.71	Yes	470	436	0.69
	No	130	126		No	290	294	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	124	204	32.83*	Yes	386	306	27.92*
	No	170	108		No	70	132	

\*0.05 level of Significance, Tabulated Value = 3.841

**2.3 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of schooling**

On comparing the private & government school teenagers of urban & rural area, the Chi-square test indicated no significant

difference in perception about impact of social marketing tools for each type of schooling. Thus hypothesis H3 for significant difference in the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of schooling is not accepted

**Table 4:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of schooling.

Schooling								
Social Marketing Tool	Response	Private		Chi-Square	Response	Government		Chi-Square
		Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural	
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	447	210	0.85	Yes	123	360	1.86
	No	150	60		No	30	120	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	312	135	0.81	Yes	78	255	0.48
	No	86	45		No	24	65	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	643	310	2.51	Yes	187	520	3.07
	No	352	140		No	68	280	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	401	190	0.87	Yes	109	320	1.11
	No	196	80		No	44	160	

\*0.05 Level of Significance, Tabulated value = 3.841

**2.4 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of school**

As per the t-value (table 5) the difference was not significant for the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools except the Social Marketing Tools of

Media (boys & co-ed) and Effects of Social Marketing Tools (girls & co-ed). Thus hypothesis H8.4 for significant difference in urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of school is partially accepted.

**Table 5:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of school.

Social Marketing Tool	Response	Type of School		Chi-Square	Response	Girls		Chi-Square
		Boys				Urban	Rural	
		Urban	Rural					
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	101	91	0.21	Yes	108	35	3.74
	No	25	26		No	24	16	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	61	48	2.25	Yes	72	20	6.99
	No	23	30		No	16	14	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	168	115	21.23*	Yes	179	62	2.62
	No	42	80		No	41	23	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	109	103	0.12	Yes	121	37	11.39*
	No	17	14		No	11	14	
Social Marketing Tool	Response	Co-ed		Chi-Square				
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	361	444					
	No	131	138					
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	257	322	2.46				
	No	71	66					
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	483	653	13.57*				
	No	337	317					
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	280	370	4.95*				
	No	212	212					

\*0.05 level of Significance, Tabulated Value = 3.841

**2.5 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of family**

On comparing the nuclear & joint family groups of urban & rural teenagers the Chi-square test (table 6) indicated significant difference in perception about impact of social

marketing tools for each family type except for Social Marketing Tools at Public Places. Thus hypothesis H5 for significant difference in the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of family is partially accepted.

**Table 6:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of type of family.

Social Marketing Tool	Response	Type of Family		Chi-Square	Response	Joint		Chi-Square
		Nuclear				Urban	Rural	
		Urban	Rural					
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	408	224	34.28*	Yes	162	346	53.29*
	No	138	172		No	42	8	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	288	201	0.79	Yes	102	189	1.31
	No	76	63		No	34	47	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	570	510	38.16*	Yes	260	320	45.42*
	No	340	150		No	80	270	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	341	264	4.77*	Yes	169	246	12.11*
	No	205	132		No	35	108	

\*0.05 level of Significance, Tabulated Value = 3.841

**2.6 Difference in urban & rural teenagers perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of caste**

As per the t-value (table 7) the difference was not significant for the perception about impact of social marketing tools

except few cases Thus hypothesis H8.6 for significant difference in urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of caste is partially accepted.

**Table 7:** Chi-square test comparing the urban & rural teenager’s perception about impact of social marketing tools on the basis of caste.

Social Marketing Tool	Response	Caste		Chi-Square	Response	SC		Chi-Square
		General				Urban	Rural	
		Urban	Rural					
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	412	355	7.64*	Yes	61	123	4.44*
	No	125	68		No	17	66	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	297	245	1.86	Yes	41	87	1.74
	No	61	37		No	11	39	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	557	430	0.25	Yes	103	239	0.58
	No	338	275		No	27	76	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	353	264	1.13	Yes	59	152	0.76
	No	184	159		No	19	37	

Social Marketing Tool	Response	ST		Chi-Square	Response	OBC		Chi-Square
		Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural	
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	42	21	1.01	Yes	25	10	2.207
	No	15	12		No	8	8	
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	21	13	0.08	Yes	14	8	0.031
	No	17	9		No	8	4	
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	76	41	0.603	Yes	41	19	1.175
	No	19	14		No	14	11	
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	47	21	4.008*	Yes	19	14	2.081
	No	10	12		No	14	4	
Social Marketing Tool	Response	Other		Chi-Square				
Social Marketing Tools at School / Colleges	Yes	30	61					
	No	15	26					
Social Marketing Tools at Public Places	Yes	17	37	0.423				
	No	13	21					
Social Marketing Tools of Media	Yes	53	101	0.024				
	No	22	44					
Effects of Social Marketing Tools	Yes	32	59	0.15				
	No	13	28					

\*0.05 level of Significance, Tabulated Value = 3.841

**Conclusion & Findings**

From this research it can be concluded that the perception of urban & rural teenagers about the effects of smoking significantly differs with respect to the age & gender but no significant difference has been identified according to the schooling, type of school, type of family & caste.

Supportive evidence has been given by Liu *et al.* (2015) [19]. The study presented finding related to smoking status and risk aspects among remarkably susceptible populace of rural and urban refugee workers. It was founded that there was a crucial requisite for tobacco concerning intrusions. The study conveyed that there was no significant discrepancy in the awareness of respondents and respondents had a related attitude about smoking and the methods used to build awareness concerning the same. Lee *et al.* (2015) verified the impact of the promotional campaigns in introducing ‘give up’ intentions. It was seen that unlike age groups of respondents alleged the awareness measures being used in an unrelated way precisely the consequence and actions taken. Furthermore, it was perceived that urban/rural discernment about these awareness measures was alike.

In the line with results of the study, supportive evidence was given by Nilsson & Emmelin (2010) [23]. The study publicized that to restrain the tobacco widespread, consolidation of inclusive infringements were anticipated. The tenacity of the study was to investigate the smoking in schools of urban & rural area. It was presented that no considerable variation existed in the awareness about social marketing measures against smoking and the respondents of both the areas had alike opinion related to these measures. Muchena and Makotamo (2017) [22] stated that school was vital in building a student’s behaviour, which was consequently moulded by the education, beliefs and practices. The study quantified that in the boy’s school considerable variance was observed in terms of responsiveness measures linked with smoking and in other schools there was a varied perspicacity of awareness measures taken against smoking.

In the line with the results of the study, supportive evidence was given by Jeganathan *et al.* (2017) [9]. It was stated that in

urban and rural areas, family structure concerning nuclear & joint family was an essential part. It was stated that there was no main variation in awareness measures linked with smoking. The author’s specified that teenage was a period of transition and during this time there can be definite negative influences which the teenagers might develop. Cramm and Lee (2014) [4] recognized stages of physicality and smoking, thereby scrutinizing the relation amid certain actions based on social and demographic physiognomies. It was indicated that in the general category there was a considerable variance in the awareness of urban & rural teenagers for the awareness measures taken in inconsistency of smoking. Concerning other caste groups, schedule tribe respondents of urban & rural areas observed inversely the social measures taken against smoking.

Social marketing is a developing field. For a long time hypotheses have been made yet less data is available on its application. The standards of commercial marketing are associated with social marketing. The centre accentuation of social marketing has been lifted from behavioural change to change in position of target group of target population. Through combination of web based social networking, presently social marketing has entered whole other stage.

From the previous studies it is can be documented that more study is indispensable to comprehend the significance of countless applications in social marketing. Endorsements done by personalities have been effective in commercial marketing. Henceforth, capability of celebrity endorsement as a marketing submission in social marketing needs to be reconnoitred. Coalescing ideas from dissimilar arenas like, commercial marketing and social science, the social marketing may be accredited as predictable instrument for the assistance of the society in a defensible and gainful way.

**References**

1. Anderson A. Social marketing: Its definition and Domain. Journal of public policy and marketing, 1994; 13:108-114.
2. Anderson AR. Marketing social marketing in the social

- change market place. *Journal of public policy and marketing*, 2002; 21:3-13.
3. Conroy DM, Lee KCC. Imposed Change and Social Sustainability International. *Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability*. 2006; 2(4):64-70.
  4. Cramm J, Lee J. Smoking, physical activity and healthy aging in India. *BMC Public Health*, 2014; 14:526.
  5. Fox KF, Kotler P. Reducing cigarette smoking: an opportunity for social marketing. *Journal of health care marketing*, 1980; 10:8-17.
  6. Glouberman S, Zimmerman B. *Complicated and Complex Systems: what would successful reform of Medicare look like?* Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada, Ottawa, 2002, 8.
  7. Grier S, Bryant C. Social marketing in public health. *Annual Review Public Health*, 2005; 26:319-339.
  8. Houston F, Gassenheimer J. Marketing and exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 1987; 51(11):3-18.
  9. Jeganathan M, Jamunarani R, Arokiyamy M. A Comparative Study to Assess the Level of Knowledge on Ill Effects of Tobacco use among Adolescents Residing in Urban and Rural Areas at Kanyakumari District in A View to Develop an Information Booklets. *International Journal of Advances in Nursing Management*, Retrieved from <http://ijanm.com/HTML>, 2017; 5(2).
  10. Kelly GA. *The psychology of personal constructs*. Norton: New York, 1955.
  11. Kotler P, Armstrong G. *Principles of Marketing*. 12th Edition. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education Inc, 2008.
  12. Kotler P, Zaltman G. Social marketing: an approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing*, 1971; 35(6):3-12.
  13. Kotler P. The generic concept of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 1972; 36(4):46-54.
  14. Kotler P, Armstrong G, Saunders J, Wong V. *Principles of Marketing, the European Edition*. London: Prentice Hall, 1996.
  15. Lee SM, Landry J, Jones PM, Buhrmann O, Morley-Forster P. Long-term quit rates after a perioperative smoking cessation randomized controlled trial. *Anaesthesia and Analgesia*, 2015; 120(3):582-587.
  16. Lefebvre RC, Flora JA. Social marketing and public health intervention. *Health Education Quarterly*, 1988; 15(3):299-315.
  17. Levy SJ, Zaltman G. *Marketing, society and conflict*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.
  18. Ling JC, Franklin BAK, Lindsteadt JF, Gearion S. Social marketing: its place in public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 1992; 13:341-362.
  19. Liu Y, Song H, Wang T, Yang H, Jian G, Yao S *et al*. Determinants of tobacco smoking among rural-to-urban migrant workers: a cross-sectional survey in Shanghai. *BMC Public Health*, 2015; 15:131.
  20. McKenzie-Mohr D, Schultz PW. Choosing effective behaviour change tools. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 2014; 20(1):35-46.
  21. McKenzie-Mohr D, Smith W. Fostering sustainable behaviour: An introduction to community-based social marketing 2nd Ed. Gabriola Island, British Columbia, Canada: New Society, 1999.
  22. Muchena P, Makotamo J. Drug Misuse among High School candidates in Mutare Urban and Peri Manicaland Province, Zimbabwe. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*. 2017; 7(3):63-72.
  23. Nilsson M, Emmelin M. Immortal but frightened - smoking adolescents perceptions on smoking uptake and prevention. *BJM Public Health*, 2010; 10:776.
  24. Tena MAM. El marketing social: una aproximación teorica. *ICE Tribuna de Economía*, 1988, 774.
  25. Zikmund WG, Stanton WJ. Recycling solid wastes: A channels-of-distribution problem. *Journal of Marketing*. 1971; 35(3):34-9.