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INTRODUCTION

Social marketing is defined as “influencing the acceptability of social ideas through product planning, pricing, communication, distribution, and marketing research.” (Kotler and Levy 1969) As such, specific social causes could benefit from marketing thinking and planning (Kotler and Zaltman 1971), thus making marketing applicable also to public and non-profit organizations (Lovelock and Weinberg 1978). Whereas early definitions of social marketing focus only on social issues, many social marketers today take a broader viewpoint, describing social marketing as “the application of commercial marketing technologies to the analysis, planning, execution, and evaluation of programs designed to influence the voluntary behavior of target audiences in order to improve their personal welfare and that of their society” (Andreasen 1995; Kotler and Roberto 1989).

Social marketing is relevant both in a business and non-business context. For instance, non-profit organizations and other non-business organizations (e.g., governments, educational institutions, health and social service facilities) apply social marketing as a tool to communicate a point of view or elicit a particular behavior. Researches have shown that, in fact, both product marketing and social marketing are guided by the same logics. The reasons for marketing failures have been shown to be the same in both business and non-business context, ranging from poor needs assessment and poor delivery (Rothschild 1979) to an insufficient integration of marketing mix elements (Kotler and Armstrong 1991). Nowadays; social marketers acknowledge that to achieve optimum program outcomes, identification and targeting of the non-conforming cohort is paramount (Binney et al., 2006).

This study argues that it is necessary to distinguish between different types of social behavior and their underlying motives in order to achieve the marketing objectives more effectively. Consequently, understanding the social behavior of the target group means understanding the structure of social behavior and the causal relationship between its components. By doing so, message appeal strategies can
be directed at the target group effectively, making them accept specific social issues and or social change.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The social marketing concept as employed in this study will concentrate on the positive influences of social behavior on social issues. Thus, view social behavior as “pro-social and help-extending” in nature, with the goal of increasing welfare to others or oneself.

Social Marketing

In 1985, the American Marketing Association defined marketing as “... the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objective.” The latter two, goods and services, have already been defined and discussed about extensively in the management sciences. The term “idea” defined as a “result of interior cognition” by the Webster New World Dictionary and Collier’s Encyclopedia—has been applied more often recently in connection with social marketing. A recent definition refers to social marketing as “the use of marketing principles and techniques to influence a target audience to voluntarily accept, reject, modify, or abandon a behavior for the benefit of individuals, groups, or society as a whole” (Kotler et al. 2002). Based on the above definition, social marketing involves influencing voluntary behavior of people towards a broad social end by offering benefits to be received as a result of desired behavior or (Marshall 1999). Social marketing utilizes marketing strategies or methods to convey a specific impression and/or change someone’s thinking to reach the goal of the social idea provider. Moreover; effective social communication strategies and conceptual models are needed in order to plan and maintain a desired level of societal change (Hwang 2000; Dresler-Hawke 2006).

Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behavior is widely regarded as the antithesis of the negative form of behavior (e.g. Bar-Tal 1976, Wispé 1972). It constitutes a voluntary behavior that is carried out to benefit another person without anticipation of external rewards and is performed under two circumstances: (1) the behavior is done for its own end (altruism), and (2) the behavior is done as an act of restitution. For the research purpose it is necessary to clearly distinguish between altruistic and restitutional behavior: Altruistic behavior is done out of the goodness of one’s heart—it benefits
another person rather than one-self (Walster and Piliavin 1972). Restitutional behavior can be either reciprocal or compensatory in nature. With reciprocal behavior a person who has received help or a favor reciprocates by helping or returning a favor to the original donor; the action is done voluntarily for the sake of restitution and without anticipation of external rewards (Bar-Tal 1976). With compensatory behavior a person who has harmed someone later compensates the victim and the action is carried out voluntarily for restitution purposes.

Helping Behavior

Batson (1987) refers to the term “helping behavior” and finds that the motivations for engaging in helping behavior can be altruistic (help in order to increase other’s welfare) or egoistic (help in order to increase one’s own welfare) in nature. Based on the different motivations, he describes three helping behavior paths each of which can be described by a unique combination of instigating situations, a consequent internal response, a motivational state, a cost-reward analysis of potential behavior responses, and the final behavior response:

*The first path* of helping behavior is initiated by perceiving another person’s need and at the same time being aware of rewards for helping and/or punishment for not helping. The rewards gained may be economic (e.g., refunds for recycling), social (e.g., reference-group approval), or a self-reward (e.g., satisfaction). Similarly, the punishments may be economic (e.g., fines) or social (e.g., reference-group disapproval). The behavioral options are to act or have another person act in order to gain reward and/or avoid a punishment.

*The second path* of helping behavior also builds on the perception of another person in need. However, in this case the motivation for engaging in helping behavior is to reduce an internal state of aversive arousal or tensions (e.g., fear, anxiety) associated with witnessing someone in need. Helping behavior is therefore driven by the wish to relieve one’s own distress.

*The third path* of helping behavior differs from the former paths in that it requires the adoption of another person’s perspective. This path relies on empathy, in which the adoption of another person’s perspective evokes an altruistic motivation to help via empathy and sympathy. The behavioral options are to act or to have someone else act in order to reach the ultimate goal of reducing the needs of another person.

Viewpoint of Marketing

In fact, Kotler and Zaltman (1971) have used the “4P’s concept” to explain the social marketing approach. “In social marketing, sellers must package the social idea in a manner which their target audiences find desirable and are willing to
purchase.” The manner is the product for accomplishing social objective. But, the social objective (e.g., safer driving) may not be the only purpose (e.g., to create safer habits and attitudes in the population). Thus, “the social marketer remains aware of the core product (safer driving) and tries to create various tangible products and service which are buyable and which advance the social objective.” Besides, the causes types are the products of social marketing, such as altruistic causes (e.g., charity giving, blood donation), personal health causes (e.g., nonsmoking, better nutrition), and social betterment causes (e.g., civil rights, improved housing, better environment).

Comparison of Views

There are some notable overlaps but also differences between Bar-Tal’s, Batson’s, and Kotler & Zaltman’s views (see Table 1). Firstly, Bar-Tal’s altruistic behavior corresponds to Batson’s “third path of social behavior” and Kotler & Zaltman’s “altruistic causes”. Similarly, Bar-Tal’s reciprocical behavior matches with Batson’s “first path of social behavior” and Kotler & Zaltman’s “social betterment causes”. Finally, Batson’s “second path of social behavior” can be compared to Kotler & Zaltman’s “personal health causes”. Similarities also concern the classification dimensions, e.g. Bar-Tal’s “ends of behavior” and Batson’s “helping motivation, or Batson’s “ultimate goal” and Kotler & Zaltman’s “scope of causes”. However, Bar-Tal’s compensatory behavior is unique in that it has no equivalent in Batson’s or Kotler & Zaltman’s model.

Table 1. Classifying social behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Bar-Tal</th>
<th>Batson</th>
<th>Kotler and Zaltman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Prosocial behavior</td>
<td>Helping behavior</td>
<td>Social marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key point of classification</td>
<td>1. the ends of behavior</td>
<td>1. helping motivation</td>
<td>the scope of causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. restitution intention</td>
<td>2. ultimate goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same or similar</td>
<td>1. Bar-Tal’s altruism behavior is the same with the third path of Batson and altruistic causes of Kotler &amp; Zaltman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bar-Tal’s reciprocity behavior is similar with the first path of Batson and social betterment causes of Kotler &amp; Zaltman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The second path of Batson is the same with personal health causes of Kotler &amp; Zaltman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The classification method between Bar-Tal (the ends of behavior) and Batson (helping motivation) is similar; besides, Batson (ultimate goal) and Kotler &amp; Zaltman (the scope of causes) are similar also.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Bar-Tal’s compensatory behavior intends to correct one’s previous deed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A TAXONOMY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

In spite of the activities of social/idea marketing is still increasing today, there is not a complete theory concerning this issue and little literature mentioned about the classification of idea. From literature survey, Fine (1981) proposed a broadened typology of products using degree of tangibility and profit/nonprofit as the dimensions in his book. The product was divided into four types: tangible product, service, issue (cause), and idea. In Fine’s view, issues (causes) are different from and more intangible than ideas. Lovelock and Weinberg (1984) based on degree of tangibility, marketer characteristics and customer characteristics; the product was classified physical goods, services and social behavior. They argued that social behavior is “the end product of organizations that promote or advocated ideas and social causes”. Based above findings our study adopts two dimensions, the welfare receiver and the restitution intention, to distinguish four types of social behavior (see Figure 1).

Altruism: In exercising altruistic behavior the motivation is to add to the welfare of other people, personally expecting no external rewards. The restitution intention is low.

Compensation: In exercising compensatory behavior the motivation is add to the welfare of other people by correcting previous deeds. Thus, the restitution intention is high.

Reciprocity: In exercising reciprocal behavior the motivation is to add to one’s own welfare. When the adopter receives the welfare, the other person should get the welfare, too. Thus, the restitution intention is high.

Egoism: The motivation is to add to one’s own welfare. Thus, the purpose of behavior is focused on rewards for adopting and/or loss for rejecting. The restitution intention is low.

Our concept differs from previously discussed views in two points. First, unlike Fine’s (1981) and Lovelock & Weinberg (1984), we assume that social behavior or ideas cannot be marketed the same way as physical products are. In fact, even

Figure 1. Classification of Social Behavior
different types of social behavior or ideas may require different ways of marketing. Second, the dimensions we use for our taxonomy are derived from social psychology which is helpful for analyzing attitudes and values of target groups and also promotes the understanding of voluntary behavior of people.

**SOCIAL BEHAVIOR MODEL**

Based on previously mentioned models of social behavior, the authors intend to advance existing knowledge by integrating different concepts and adding some new perspectives. In particular, it deems necessary to enhance our understanding about the underlying factors which influence people’s propensity to adopt a certain social behavior. With this knowledge social-change strategies can be achieved more effectively.

### Normative Factors

Behavior is influenced by normative forces. Schwartz’s (1977) model of altruistic behavior distinguishes two levels of norms: social norms and personal norms. Broader social norms represent behavioral standards that are widely accepted by a society. Individuals who violate social norms can expect social sanctions (Fehr & Fischbacher 2004). Berkowitz and associates more specifically refer to the existence of social responsibility norms, which prescribe an individual to help those who depend on him and need his assistance (Berkowitz & Connor 1966; Berkowitz & Frideman 1967). According to this explanation, the help received from the donor heightens the salience of the norms. People who internalize the norm of social responsibility act on behalf of others, not only for material gains or social approval, but also for their own self-approval and for self-administered rewards arising from doing what is “right” (Goranson & Berkowitz 1966).

Personal norms are part of an individual’s belief system and serve as a guide in answering the question “What should I do about it?” Personal norms are formed in the course of the socialization process, as learned expectations towards societal norms interact with personal experiences (Bar-Tal 1976). The borderline between social and personal norms is therefore not always a distinct one. Osterhus (1997), for instance, regards social norms as the source of personal norms. The internalization of a norm mediates the influence of social norms on behavior.

### Economic Factors

Economic evaluation is another important driver of human behavior. Homans’ (1958) social exchange theory built on the premise that individual behavior is
guided by the principle of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs in order to obtain the most profitable outcomes in human interaction. The rewards include material benefits, such as money or goods, and social rewards, such as approval, recognition, or power (Piliavin et al., 1969). Argandoña (2004) also indicated norms and rules that control the economic behavior of people, and the incentives or motivations of the economic agents. This description portrays a model of an “economic man,” that is, one who calculates each act and seeks rewards in each interaction. Even in the case of altruistic behavior, which per definition does not strive for external rewards, an individual may expect internal rewards such as pride, enhanced self-esteem, or good feeling (Bar-Tal 1976). Thus, from a benefit-point-of-view social behavior is driven by the anticipation of material and/or psychological benefits. However, Piliavin et al. (1969) point out that social behavior can also be the result of psychological cost considerations. A bystander who doesn’t help may feel shame, guilt, and empathic distress at seeing a victim’s suffering. Bar-Tal (1976) takes an integrative view by arguing that individuals in an exchange situation will evaluate the reward and costs before taking action: They will subtract the costs (e.g., loss of time, effort, money) from the rewards (e.g., satisfaction, pride, money) and then put the difference in relation to required investments. Thus, rewards and costs may have external sources (e.g., society) and/or internal sources (e.g., individual). Similarly, Osterhus (1997) concludes that whether a norm translates into action depends on two important variables: (1) an awareness of the consequence of action/inaction and (2) an attribution of personal responsibility towards the action (e.g., I am responsible for obeying the traffic rules). We therefore conclude that (a) individual engagement in a specific social behavior is the result of economic evaluation and that (b) economic evaluation is affected by internal awareness (personal norms) and external pressure (social norms).

Behavioral Motivation

In the previous section, material and psychological response form a behavior motivation. According to the second path of Batson’s (1987) helping behavior, the motivation of a specific behavior is to reduce distress or pacify someone’s internal state. An imbalance in personal internal state is caused when people see other people in need, which may cause an individual to experience personal distress—to feel upset, anxious, or disturbed. Reducing personal distress could be viewed as social behavior motivation. The magnitude of this aversive vicarious emotion appears to be a function of three factors: (1) the magnitude of the perceived need, (2) its salience, and (3) its personal relevance to oneself (Piliavin & Piliavin 1973). However, one should note that aversive vicarious emotions are also influenced by social norms and personal norms, and that the magnitude of these emotions is the result of economic evaluation.
According to Batson’s (1987) third path of helping behavior, motivation for a specific behavior is evoked by empathy. Empathy has been defined in at least three different ways: (1) as feeling any vicarious emotion, (2) as feeling the same emotion that another person is feeling, and (3) as feeling a vicarious emotion that is congruent with but not necessarily identical to the emotion of another person (Batson & Coke, 1981; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987, Hoffman 1981). From above statements and definitions, this study argues that empathy could be viewed as social behavior motivation, driven by external (social norms) and internal factors (personal norms). In addition, Batson (1991) argues that empathy is affected by the level of closeness to the other person, i.e. the closer one is to the person in need, the greater the likelihood of adopting that person’s perspective. Thus, empathic emotion forms as the result of a subconscious evaluation of relationship intensity.

Looking from a different perspective, the first path of Batson’s (1987) helping behavior identifies the motivation for a specific behavior in gaining rewards for helping and/or avoiding punishments for not helping. This seems distinct from the second and third path. However, actions that move a person towards gaining rewards or avoiding punishments also reduce one’s own distress—such as when a witness saves someone trapped in a burning building by putting out the fire. On the other hand, acting to gain reward or avoid punishment simultaneously reduces the other person’s distress. From the reward-punishment-pattern (including material, social and self-reward) we can conclude that motivation is influenced by economic evaluation, social norms and individual factors.

Actual Control Factors

Ajzen’s theory of planned behavior (1989) emphasizes the role of behavioral intention in explaining actual behavior. Intentions measure the degree of how much effort people are planning to exert in order to perform the behavior. He postulates as follows: First, the attitude toward the behavior refers to the degree to which the person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation of the behavior in question. It is regarded as the result of outcome evaluation. The second predictor is termed subjective norm and represents a social factor. It refers to the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior. The third is the degree of perceived behavioral control. This factor refers to the perceived case or difficulty of performing the behavior and it is assumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles. As a general rule, the more favorable the attitude, subjective norm with respect to a behavior, and the greater the perceived behavioral control, the stronger should be an individual’s intention to perform the behavior under consideration. Behavioral intention turns into an immediate antecedent of actual behavior. That is, the stronger people’s intentions to engage in a behavior or to achieve their behavioral goals, the more successful
they are predicted to be. Based on Ajzen’s views we argue that behavioral intention exerts a positive influence on actual behavior.

However, the degree of success will depend not only on one’s desire or intention, but also on such non-motivational factors as availability of requisite opportunities and resources, such as time, money, skill, and cooperation of others, etc (Ajzen 1989). Collectively, these factors eventually determine whether a behavior will take place. Thus, we argue that (1) the attitude toward the behavior is a result of economic evaluation, (2) “subjective norm” in Ajzen’s model is equal to social norm, (3) the degree of perceived behavioral control is determined by actual control factors (including opportunities and resources) that influence behavioral intention and thus behavioral patterns.

Based on the causal relations between above mentioned factors we propose an integrated social behavior model (Figure 2). Social behavior is seen as the result of social behavior intention in the presence of favorable actual control factors. Social behavior intention, in turn, is antecedent by behavioral motivation which forms through the simultaneous impact of social norms, personal norms and economic evaluation. Social norms exert significant influence on both personal norms and economic evaluation.

**MESSAGE APPEALS**

A message appeal is an approach chosen by the communicator to communicate with his target audience in order to produce the desired responses. Numerous classifications of advertising appeals have been presented by different scholars,
including (a) memory, rationalized, success, economy, and fear appeals (Bridge 1950; Ray 1982), (b) emotional, intellectual, curiosity, esthetic, and ethical (Donald 1955; Nylen 1986), (c) value-expressive/symbolic appeals and utilitarian/functional appeals (Park, Jaworski and MacInnis 1986), and (d) rational, emotional, and moral appeals (Kotler and Keller 2006). Nevertheless, most scholars (e.g., Shimp 1990; Hetsroni 2000. Fox et al., 2001) agree that it is plausible to delineate rational from emotional appeals.

**Rational appeals** are directed towards the audience’s self-interest. They show how the product will produce the claimed benefits, i.e. the content of message describes the product’s quality, value or performance.

**Emotional appeals** attempt to stir up negative or positive emotions that will motivate purchase. In addition, marketers utilize negative appeals such as fear, guilt and shame, to get people to take specific actions.

In social exchange theory (Homans 1958), individual behavior is guided by the principle of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs in order to obtain the most profitable outcome in any interaction. The cost-reward theory (Piliavin et al., 1969) indicates that the person in a position to help calculates the relationship between possible costs and rewards of a possible altruistic action. Thus, we propose:

**P1:** Rational appeals will influence ideas related to self-interest (i.e. Egoism and Reciprocity).

Exchange theory (Homans, 1958) also points out that rewards include material benefits and social rewards. Even altruistic behavior may be based on anticipated internal rewards such as pride, enhanced self-esteem, or good feeling. Thus, we propose:

**P2:** Emotional appeals will influence ideas related to others (i.e. Altruism and Compensation).

**MESSAGE FRAME**

Kahneman and Tversky (1979) have studied the effect of framing on consumer decision. Although decisions can be framed in many different ways, advertising messages often involve the use of a specific type of frame, i.e. goal framing. In this case, advertisers can frame the usage of a product in a positive manner (e.g., highlighting the potential of the product to provide gains or benefits) or in a negative manner (highlighting the potential to avoid loss or solve problems) (see Levin, Schneider and Gaeth 1998; Buda 2003). Prospective theory (Kahneman and Tversky 1979) was used to explain the result. The theory suggests that framing a problem in terms of gains or losses has two major outcomes. First, it holds...
that people are risk-averse when a decision problem is formulated in terms of gains, and they are risk-prone when the problem is formulated in terms of loss. Second, it suggests that people perceive losses as more painful than gains.

For compensatory and reciprocal behavior, where the restitution intention is high, rejecting the behavior will lead to a two-side loss and create highly risk-averse emotion. Thus, in order to induce a specific behavior, a marketer could emphasize on the potential cost or loss resulting from rejecting the behavior. Thus, we propose:

**P3:** Negative message frame can effectively induce compensation and reciprocal behavior.

For egoistic and altruistic behavior, the restitution intention is low. Here, using a positive message frame by highlighting the potential gains and benefits associated with a specific behavior will more effectively induce people to engage in that behavior. Thus, we propose:

**P4:** Positive message frame can effectively induce egoistic and altruistic behavior.

### Persuasion Route

Cacioppo and Petty (1985) use the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) to explain the communication of persuasion. This model suggests that a person’s level of involvement during message processing is a critical factor in determining which route of persuasion is likely to be effective. The **central persuasion route** is characterized by high level of involvement (e.g., the message is personally relevant). In this situation the potential buyer will attend to the message, perform an internal as well as external search, analyze advertising content and come to conclusions. In contrast, the **peripheral persuasion route** is characterized by a low level of involvement. In such circumstances the processing of the advertising content will be performed by using peripheral cues in the advertising content such as source credibility (Rhine and Severance 1970), sympathy with source (Petty and Cacioppo 1984), or communicator’s voice in broadcast messages (Miniard et al., 1991).

It should be emphasized that in most cases no specific route is employed exclusively at the absolute expense of the other. Usually, both routes are operated at different levels. Where involvement is high, the dominant component in generating reaction is cognitive, while emotional factors play a secondary role only. An inverted mix characterizes situations of low involvement (Lord et al., 1995). For those ideas related to self-interest, (i.e. egoism and reciprocity), the level of involvement will be high and the individual will calculate the possible reward. Thus, we propose:
Central persuasion route can more effectively induce egoistic and reciprocal behavior than peripheral persuasion route.

In contrast, when the welfare appeal is directed at others (i.e. altruism and compensatory), the direct involvement of an individual is low. The evaluation of message depends on the advertising content. Thus, we propose:

Peripheral persuasion route can more effectively induce altruistic and compensatory behavior than central persuasion route.

**MESSAGE STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

Given above propositions, the authors combine message appeal, message frame and persuasion route to propose the following message strategies for different types of social behavior (Table 2).

**Altruistic marketing:** Here, behavioral intention is to add welfare to other people without expecting external rewards. Our study suggests choosing an emotional message appeal and positive message framing along the peripheral persuasion route. Even for a truly altruistic, i.e. selfless, potential helper who does not ask for any kind of reward, message content emphasizing on the importance/benefit to others and society as a whole may enhance message effectiveness.

**Compensatory marketing:** Behavioral intention is to add welfare to others and correct previous deeds. The suggested message strategy here is to utilize emotional appeals and negative message framing while adopting a peripheral persuasion route to evoke empathy. During message delivery, the awareness for correcting previous deeds is more direct than norm rules. From the standpoint of a potential helper, even no reward and/or the need to invest costs may drive him to engage in a behavioral pattern that allows him to achieve his own purpose.

**Reciprocity marketing:** The behavioral purpose here is to add welfare to oneself and other people. We suggest utilizing negative rational appeals and adopting central persuasion to evoke empathy. Following the notion of social exchange theory, according to which individual behavior is guided by the principle
of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs in order to obtain the most profitable outcomes in any human interaction, using economic appeals seems advisable if the target audience is focused on its own welfare (e.g., gain for doing and/or loss for rejecting). Drawing attention to the anticipated outcome (or consequences) of reciprocal behavior appeals to consumers with high degree of rationality and justice thinking.

**Egoism marketing:** Egoistic behavior strives to increase one’s own welfare. Hence, we suggest utilizing a positive rational appeal and adopting a central persuasion route to reduce internal state. The message should focus on economic considerations, i.e. rewards for engaging in and/or loss for rejecting a specific behavior.

Implications for social marketing

Three implications for social marketing shall be discussed on the following:

**The influence of norms:** With social norms simultaneously influencing personal norms and economic evaluation, social marketers can utilize normative appeals to amplify personal norms and/or reduce a negative evaluation of behavior. People with a high cognition of social responsibility norms base their behavioral decisions more on “psychological” rather than “material” evaluation, i.e. they will engage in a behavioral pattern, even if the cost of the behavior is high and/or the reward of behavior is low. In contrast, if people demonstrate high economic rationale, message strategies should apply rational appeals emphasizing the benefits (tangible and intangible) associated with a specific behavior and/or emphasizing the losses as a result of rejecting a specific behavior.

**Behavioral motivation:** Behavioral motivation is affected by normative factors and economic considerations. People driven by responsibility norms are sensitive of other people’s suffering. Here, social marketers can emphasize the consequences of rejection of social behavior, thus evoking aversive vicarious emotions. On the other hand, persons driven by economic considerations respond more effectively to delightful appeals evoking an emotional reaction of empathy.

**Behavioral intention:** Four factors affect behavioral intention: (1) normative factors (i.e. social and personal norms) prescribing a behavior conform with general or personal belief, (2) economic considerations, with people evaluating the possible benefits for himself or others, (3) behavioral motivation, which could be to reduce ones own distress and/or solve others’ predicament. In addition to these subjective factors, (4) objective control factors will also exert an influence on both behavioral intention and actual behavior. People may intend to demonstrate social behavior but not be able to do so because of inadequate resources or lack of opportunities. Thus, social marketers should provide convenience and/or support to their target audience, so as to facilitate the implementation of social behavior.
In summary, this study provides a more detailed look at the factors underlying social behavior. An integrated model of social behavior is introduced and message strategies for different types of social behavior proposed. However, the conceptual model is based on literature research and has not been tested empirically. Future research can be arranged to help test the concept of this paper. For example, one could utilize fuzzy logic to classify an obscure phenomenon such as social behavior. Alternatively, one could employ structural equation modeling to test the causal relationships between variables of the model. Probably not all of the causal relationships will prove to be significant; but nevertheless it can help clarify the importance and influence level of variables in different types of social behavior. More extensive research on message strategies and advertising appeal strategies for social marketing is also necessary to complement our findings.
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