

This is the accepted version of the following article: [Rundle-Thiele, S., Mitchell, S.-L., Lee, Z. and Hyde, F. \(2024\), "Refocusing marketing effort to support net-positive social impact", *European Journal of Marketing*,.](#) It was accepted for publication on 07/08/24. It is available under a CC BY-NC licence, and the final published version is available here: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-06-2023-0465>

Response to Reviewers (Manuscript ID: EJM-06-2023-0465. R1)

Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to further improve our manuscript entitled: “Refocusing effort to the delivery of net-positive impact: A marketing research and practice agenda.” for further consideration for publication in the *European Journal of Marketing*. We would like to thank the Editor and the expert peer reviewers for their constructive feedback. We have addressed reviewer comments on a point-by-point basis below and uploaded a clean version of the revised manuscript for your consideration.

Sincerely,
The Authors

Reviewer	Comment(s)	Response(s)
R1	<p>1) The aim and contribution of the paper could be made even more specific in the introduction section, particularly in the paragraph copied below. I found it difficult to grasp what the authors mean exactly by e.g., “contribute efforts to support a path forward” or “interrogate dollars and human time”. Being more specific in terms of what the provided framework and research agenda should do for marketing researchers would be beneficial here.</p> <p><i>“A new Social Impact Pathway is described to support marketing researchers and practitioners who seek to undertake societal change projects, illustrated through best-practice examples. Our aim is to help ensure we aren’t talking from an abstract viewpoint disconnected from practice. We understand that defining any impact is challenging and a contribution of this paper is to contribute effort that aims to support a path forward. Our motivation is to ask questions capable of illuminating how funds and human time invested to deliver changes that are beneficial to people and the planet. As a community, it is</i></p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. The language has been made more specific as recommended.</p> <p>The paper now states:</p> <p><i>A new Social Impact Pathway is described to support marketing researchers and practitioners who seek to undertake societal change projects, illustrated through best-practice examples. Our aim is to help ensure we aren’t talking from an abstract viewpoint that is disconnected from practice. We understand that defining any impact is challenging and a contribution of this paper is to contribute effort that aims to support a path forward. Our motivation is to show how clear links can be demonstrated to confidently explain the cost savings for communities that are funding social, health and environmental work. As a community, it is important we make sure that we are seeing a return for all the time and funds invested. Transparent impact estimation efforts are urgently needed if we are to turn the tide on fundamental world challenges.</i></p>

Reviewer	Comment(s)	Response(s)
	<i>important we learn how to interrogate dollars and human time spent by linking investments and time to the activities performed. Transparent impact estimation efforts are urgently needed if we are to turn the tide on fundamental world challenges.” (p. 3)</i>	
R1	2) I was wondering whether the social impact itself should also be represented in the central framework, for example as a central element between B and C specifying what social impact is and its multi-faceted nature.	Thank you for this comment. We have placed social impact at the start of the process. A social impact pathway requires that organisations are very clear about what they are trying to do. We have included more specific language in the central framework as recommended. Please see figure 1.
R1	3) The paper would benefit from a final round of copy editing to address some minor typos, formatting issues, and consistent use of acronyms (e.g., SIP).	We have copy edited the paper as recommended. We have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Taken the numbering out of the titles and the bold off the sub-titles. - Added a few hyphens to better reflect EJM house style - Taken out all acronyms including the SIP for social impact pathway. Only well-known acronyms remain to enhance readability as recommended (e.g. UN SDGs and CSR) - Added the oxford comma throughout - Ensure sure all the <i>et als.</i> are in italics. - Standardised capitals for consistency throughout

1
2
3
4 **Title: Refocusing marketing effort to support net-positive social impact**
5

6 **Article Classification:** Original Article
7

8
9 **Article Category:** Conceptual Paper
10

11
12 **Structured Abstract:**
13

14
15 **Purpose** - Social impact research remains in its infancy. The purpose of the paper is to build
16 on Keeling and Marshall's (2022) 'Call for impact' paper and develop a comprehensive Social
17 Impact Pathway framework. The aim is to encourage marketing researchers, nonprofits, and
18 corporations to pursue impactful work that is valued, planned, monitored, and evaluated.
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Design/approach** - The conceptual paper explores the complexities of estimating social impact
25 drawing from a range of illustrative cases.
26
27

28
29 **Findings** - The paper identifies a lack of clarity in the understanding and application of impact
30 and presents a pathway aimed at increasing focus on social impact across future work to deliver
31 the net-positive changes that are needed to reverse biodiversity decline, climate change, and
32 social and health inequalities that continue to be persist and be experienced by so many planet-
33 wide.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 **Originality** - This paper aims to encourage marketing researchers to engage in social change
42 projects, rather than solely disseminating academic findings. Emphasising the importance of
43 an outside-in approach, this paper highlights the necessity of showcasing accumulated
44 outcomes to demonstrate impact. The paper contributes a pathway forward to encourage and
45 support increased utilisation of the framework in future marketing research.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 **Practical implications** - Mapping and measuring social impact pathways are concerted efforts
54 directing understanding towards identifying the activities that are contributing to the delivery
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of outputs that can achieve intended outcomes. The measurement of impact directs investment
5
6 towards activities that ensure net-positive gains are achieved.
7

8
9 **Social implications** - Ever growing social inequities, health disparities, loss of biodiversity,
10
11 and environmental degradation occur when practices are left unchecked. A focus on impact
12
13 avoids greenwashing practices, ensuring that an understanding of what has changed because of
14
15 our work is transparently reported.
16
17
18
19

20 **Keywords** Impact, Net positive, Impact framework, Social value, Social impact pathway,
21
22 Non-profit organisations, Research outcomes, Social purpose.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Refocusing marketing effort to support net-positive social impact

Background

The purpose of this paper is to encourage marketing academics to contribute to social change programs to ensure their work makes a positive difference in the world. It builds upon the call for research to support and encourage 'Better Marketing for a Better World' (Chandy *et al.*, 2021). For the marketing researcher and practitioner alike, this is an opportunity to make a difference, and to counter some of the criticisms that the marketing profession attracts - including unethical marketing practices, immoral behaviours, and excessive commercial gains (Lim *et al.*, 2023; Delistavrou *et al.*, 2020; Ingram *et al.*, 2005). Additionally, global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity, environmental degradation, social and health inequities, poverty, and violence (treasury.gov.au, 2023; gov.uk, 2013) compound the urgency of the matter. In response, there is a need for a new way of conducting impactful research. The current paper specifically focuses on a societal change approach that is distinct from the recent hype and confusion around impact research.

A new Social Impact Pathway is described to support marketing researchers and practitioners who seek to undertake societal change projects, illustrated through best-practice examples. Our aim is to help ensure we aren't talking from an abstract viewpoint that is disconnected from practice. We understand that defining any impact is challenging and a contribution of this paper is to contribute effort that aims to support a path forward. Our motivation is to show how clear links can be demonstrated to confidently explain the cost savings for communities that are funding social, health and environmental work. As a community, it is important we make sure that we are seeing a return for all time and funds invested. Transparent impact estimation efforts are urgently needed if we are to turn the tide on fundamental world challenges.

1
2
3
4 Through anchoring efforts in one or more of the 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals
5 (UN SDG), academic energy and expertise can be focused on making a net-positive impact.
6
7
8 By increasing transparency, we can all learn how impact is achieved. This is very timely given
9
10 that greenwashing will no longer be tolerated in some jurisdictions (e.g., Europe). These
11
12 legislative moves recognise that for too long we have been avoiding the types of activities and
13
14 efforts that are truly needed to achieve the outcomes and lasting impact that our society urgently
15
16 needs.
17
18

19
20 This paper explicitly builds upon the impact innovation efforts led by Debbie Keeling
21
22 and Greg Marshall (2022), which included a new article format for the European Journal of
23
24 Marketing (EJM) that was launched in 2022. The EJM impact paper was specifically designed
25
26 to allow collaborators to showcase how their research has already achieved, or can be expected
27
28 to achieve, impact. Keeling and Marshall (2022) encouraged researchers to share their social
29
30 change process and reflect on the realities and complexities of delivering impact, including
31
32 dealing with the unexpected and often changing nature of impact. Keeling and Marshall (2022)
33
34 outlined five key pillars for social impact work: problem generation and identifying the impact
35
36 to be achieved, working with stakeholders, the (co-) creation and learning process, impact
37
38 outcomes, and the ethics of impact. We note that an organising framework was not provided.
39
40
41

42
43 This paper begins by defining what we mean by social impact and identifies how this
44
45 understanding is distinct to other perspectives on impact. The Social Impact Pathway is then
46
47 described and illustrated using case studies. The paper provides insights into current progress
48
49 in impact measurement all of which provide opportunities for future research, which are
50
51 detailed in a research agenda.
52
53
54
55

56 **Definition of social impact**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Social impact estimations or value calculations disentangle the various efforts of the many
5
6 organisations aiming to tackle society's most wicked problems by delivering clear
7
8 understanding of what has occurred (or not) because of cumulative effort to address a specific
9
10 issue. Impact is the portion of the total outcome that happened because of the activity of the
11
12 venture, above and beyond what would have happened anyway (Clark and Rosenzweig, 2004).
13
14 Wainwright (2002) notes that impact is any change resulting from an activity, project, or
15
16 organisation. Different terms used to describe social impact include social value, social return,
17
18 social return on investment, and social accounting. Considering the different domains in which
19
20 social impact is studied (e.g., education, health care, sustainability, and poverty), comparisons
21
22 remain challenging in the absence of mapped impact pathways that explain how impact arises
23
24 through cumulative actions and outputs (Izzo, 2013).
25
26
27
28

29 The Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK defines impact as '*an effect on,*
30
31 *change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the*
32
33 *environment or quality of life, beyond academia*' (UKRI, 2024). There are three considerations
34
35 for marketing academics at work. First, does the project/study specifically address a societal
36
37 problem, anchored in the UN SDGs. The REF's definition asks academics to take an outside-
38
39 in view. Exercises such as the REF aim to focus consideration on whether research is delivering
40
41 a measurable benefit economically, environmentally, or socially. For individual marketing
42
43 academics this requires them to ask, "Did the academic research go on to make an impact on
44
45 society, for example resulting in a change in government policy or practices or direct delivery
46
47 of an intended and positive change to systems, structures or individual behaviours?". The San
48
49 Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (sfidora.org, 2012) called for a reappraisal of
50
51 the way in which we evaluate our research calling for us to assess the consequences of research
52
53 [afterwards]. These distinctions are clearly represented in a 2024 multi-authored editorial
54
55 entitled 'Real impact: Challenges and opportunities in bridging the gap between research and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 practice – Making a difference in industry, policy, and society’ (Dwivedi *et al.*, 2024). The
5
6 authors call for ‘*evaluation of tangible impact **from** academic research*’ [emphasis added] (p.1)
7
8 and remind us of the conventional perspective that ‘*the impact of academic research can be*
9
10 *measured using quantitative methods such as policy change references*’ (p.1). Dwivedi *et al.*
11
12 (2024) identify the need to disseminate findings of research in an accessible way, arguing
13
14 ‘*Research outcomes should lead to larger good in terms of superior products, practices,*
15
16 *services, policies or any other positive change in the societal ecosystem*’ (p.41). However,
17
18 despite guidance from the authors that impact should be considered at the start of a research
19
20 project rather than being bolted-on at the end, it can be argued that fundamentally this is not
21
22 currently occurring at the scale needed as practices obfuscate with ideas such as impact factors
23
24 aiming to quantify possible influence of journal publications, which cannot be mixed with the
25
26 delivery of social impact.
27
28
29
30


31
32 The delivery of intended, positive social impact which we present in this paper, involves
33
34 marketing academics collaborating with a variety of stakeholders who are involved in
35
36 delivering programs, products, or services capable of driving positive social change. Any
37
38 subsequent research publications record the societal outcomes of the project and share
39
40 learnings from the process undertaken, but the publications are not in, and of themselves, the
41
42 end goal. Attempting to solve a societal problem is the purpose, and that is something that we
43
44 find extremely motivating and believe is something other marketing researchers should jump
45
46 to be part of.
47
48
49
50

51 52 **Social impact mapping**

53
54 To move forward, we need to consider impact as a pathway. Understanding the impact pathway
55
56 is the result of a mapping process. Mapping demonstrates how inputs are directed into activities
57
58 and observable outputs capable of achieving intended outcomes. Social impact mapping can
59
60

directly inform estimations of return on investment. Impact pathways have also been referred to as impact value chains or program logic models by evaluation researchers. Clark and Rosenzweig's (2004) Impact Value Chain contains inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes. Clark and Rosenzweig (2004) state that impact is the outcome changes minus what would have happened anyway. We note this model is also presented in the recent paper by Dwivedi *et al.* (2024). To gain a full appreciation of impact, an understanding of how outcome evaluations are performed is recommended. An outcomes lens ensures that discourse and narrative is grounded in practice and avoids conceptual, abstract thinking which doesn't reflect reality. Quantitative outcome evaluations ensure that an understanding of who changes, when, where, and how is built.

Figure 1: Social Impact Pathway



Many scholars may dismiss impact mapping and assessment on the grounds these are management tools facilitating organisational learning, reinforcing missions that are used to

1
2
3
4 attract additional funding (Pathak and Dattani, 2014). Yet, evidenced approaches
5
6 demonstrating the cumulative actions arising to achieve positive societal changes are needed if
7
8 we are to understand how to build impact from the very start. It is vital that we know which
9
10 outputs achieve the intended outcomes when people engage with programs, products, or
11
12 services. This understanding is required so that we know which activities we can turn off, which
13
14 outputs are not delivering outcomes, and which organisational practices are delivering net
15
16 negative consequences for people and the planet. This practice is not unfamiliar to health
17
18 practitioners, ecologists, and other professions aiming to provide social support, deliver health,
19
20 and/or environment outcomes. Understanding outcomes achieved is important as it directs
21
22 considerations to the consequences that arise from the activities that professionals, community
23
24 members, and organisations perform, delivering the transparency needed for accountability that
25
26 can more reliably inform governance models and ensure that net positive gains are resulting
27
28 from each organisation's activity. By bringing transparency, impact assessments enable us to
29
30 gain a shared understanding of which organisations are delivering good, and which are
31
32 contributing harm by perpetuating or furthering social and health inequities and environmental
33
34 damage.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 It is important to note that impact encompasses intended and unintended effects,
42
43 negative as well as positive, and long-term as well as short-term. We observe that many authors
44
45 assume that impacts are positive changes for society, yet negative changes can and do result
46
47 from organisational activities and our profession would benefit from including ideas like
48
49 unintended consequences into practice. It is for this reason that the Learn-Reflect-Adapt cycle
50
51 is a crucial part of the mapping process (illustrated in Figure 1). Reflection on any unforeseen
52
53 negative impacts, spill-over effects of the activity onto other activities or stakeholder groups,
54
55 and/or identification (and remedy) of any ethical issues such as power imbalances between
56
57 stakeholders is key. Indeed, ensuring over-representation of disadvantaged groups is one way
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to minimise this risk. On a positive note, this reflective test and learn cycle is also a means to
5
6 provide proof of concept to attract future funding to expand a program either to widen impact
7
8 geographically or deepen the participation, and therefore impact, in the original area.
9

10
11
12
13 *A) Problem identification: Societal change anchored in UN Sustainable Development Goals*

14
15 When considering Keeling and Marshall's (2022) pillars, the first important aspect is the
16
17 identification of the problem and the desired impact. As an example, research on social impact
18
19 in non-profit organisations typically follows an inside-out approach, focusing on organisational
20
21 identity, capabilities, leadership, structure, and relationships (Keith *et al.*, 2022; Lee and
22
23 Davies, 2021), rather than an outside-in approach, emphasising the perspective of beneficiaries
24
25 (Benjamin *et al.*, 2023). This is surprising as non-profit organisations, as higher-purpose
26
27 natives, possess valuable insider knowledge and a deep understanding of the specific issues
28
29 they aim to address such as poverty and the empowerment of marginalised or underrepresented
30
31 groups (Lee *et al.*, 2023; Mirzaei *et al.*, 2021). Benjamin *et al.* (2023) argue that involving
32
33 beneficiaries from the beginning is crucial in ensuring the success of social impact initiatives,
34
35 shifting the focus from how the program helps beneficiaries to actively involving them in the
36
37 impact journey and mapping. This inclusive approach has the potential to yield both intended
38
39 and unintended consequences, highlighting the importance of carefully navigating the
40
41 involvement of beneficiaries throughout the process. In the non-profit context, this is
42
43 particularly important as the funders (individual donors, foundations, service commissioners)
44
45 are not the beneficiaries and, in the absence of impact pathway models, the need to ensure time
46
47 and funds invested are maximising outcomes can be lost.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 An illustration of a non-profit organisation attempting to realign their practices to better
55
56 achieve their intended outcomes can be seen in SCOPE, a national disability charity in the UK.
57
58 SCOPE underwent a rebranding exercise with the aim of addressing disability inequality and
59
60

1
2
3
4 shifting from being a mere service provider to becoming an advocate and campaigner, as
5
6 demonstrated by their Gamechanger project (Dufour, 2020). Through reframing the problem
7
8 and redefining its mission, SCOPE sought to create a strong community comprising both
9
10 disabled and non-disabled individuals, harnessing collective power to challenge attitudes and
11
12 injustice. By involving beneficiaries, SCOPE recognised that disabled individuals had
13
14 difficulty understanding the organisation's role in the modern world, as it was primarily
15
16 associated with historical work related to children with cerebral palsy. This led to questioning
17
18 its relevance. The strategic shift also signalled and reinforced the transition from a medical
19
20 model of disability, focusing on individual impairments, to a social model that identifies
21
22 societal barriers (Dufour, 2020).
23
24
25

26
27 With over 13 million disabled people in the UK, representing approximately 1 in 5
28
29 individuals (Kirk-Wade, 2022), SCOPE's efforts are now more clearly aligned to the pathway
30
31 to impact, anchored in UN SDG#10 aiming to reduce inequalities. The organization supported
32
33 over 3.5 million people, an increase of 1 million from the previous year (SCOPE, 2022). This
34
35 allowed SCOPE to concentrate on two key areas: addressing inequality issues in employment
36
37 and building narratives within the community, particularly for families with disabled children.
38
39 In families with disabled children, the Gamechanger project expanded the reach of various
40
41 services such as 'Navigate,' a national mentoring program that offers online emotional support
42
43 to parents and carers of disabled children. Feedback from parents revealed that 85%
44
45 experienced improved well-being, and 74% reported feeling more resilient after utilizing the
46
47 service (SCOPE, 2022). These efforts could demonstrate impact delivered by SCOPE if clear
48
49 links between accumulated wellbeing and resilience could be attributed to reductions in health
50
51 or social service provision (Kaplan, 2020) delivering cost savings to communities.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 *B) Stakeholder collaboration: Co-creation of activity and outcome measures*
60

1
2
3
4 The second pillar to generating social impact is recognising the importance of collaboration
5
6 with various stakeholders to maximise their impact (Keeling and Marshall, 2022). For any
7
8 enterprise, the involvement of multi-stakeholders such as funders, beneficiaries, communities,
9
10 and government, each with their own criteria for assessing impact effectiveness (Kanter and
11
12 Summers, 1987; Keith *et al.*, 2022) takes effort to disentangle. When multiple stakeholders are
13
14 involved, data is needed to ensure any claim or attributions for each stakeholder's activities
15
16 and outputs is clearly linked to observed outcomes. Strong relationships are also needed to
17
18 ensure a collaborative rather than competitive approach occurs. Additionally, it is important to
19
20 note that learning processes stemming from collaboration and co-creation can lead to the
21
22 discovery of unintended changes (Keeling and Marshall, 2022). In such situations, multi-
23
24 stakeholders must exhibit courage to explore new directions that could deliver net positive
25
26 outcomes. However, funders, whether individuals or government entities, increasingly expect
27
28 social change programmes to deliver outcomes and impact. Given the inherent complexities,
29
30 managers with transparent impact agendas might hesitate to allocate resources towards certain
31
32 social programs, especially when servicing marginalised groups, which may be perceived as
33
34 less attractive to future funders due to lower social return on investments. For example, some
35
36 beneficiaries, such as children, may be more favourably perceived given demonstration of
37
38 impact is calculated across a longer lifetime span compared to the aged. Moreover, children
39
40 and animals might be more appealing for future funding opportunities, given their potential for
41
42 compelling storytelling (Mitchell and Clark, 2021). These biases often make marketing
43
44 managers more cautious when attempting to communicate impact and performance to funders.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Rundle-Thiele *et al.* (2019) summarise how stakeholders and community were involved
53
54 in the initial co-design resulting in Leave It – a dog training program that teaches dog owners
55
56 and dog trainers how to teach their dog to avoid wildlife. This work contributes to SDG#15 –
57
58 life on land. A variety of stakeholders helped the marketing team to identify new approaches
59
60

1
2
3
4 that could be trialled. Specifically, conservation experts were critical in teaching the marketing
5
6 team that wildlife aversion could be taught to dogs and dog trainers made it clear that it takes
7
8 four weeks to teach dog owners how to achieve new behaviours in their dogs. Noting that
9
10 impact cannot always be directly assessed (see Ebrahim and Rangan, 2014) the proof-of-
11
12 concept trial was first run in one local government area in 2017 demonstrating that wildlife
13
14 aversion could be achieved through a repeated measure outcome evaluation which considered
15
16 dogs abilities before and after completion of the 4-week program (David *et al.*, 2019). Leave
17
18 It training sessions were sold to dog owners in the local area who went on to complete a 4-
19
20 week training program (Rundle-Thiele *et al.*, 2022). Following the initial pilot program
21
22 success, a change in focus was undertaken and in the subsequent 2½ years the marketing team
23
24 delivered a train the trainer program city-wide. After 3½ years koala hospital data demonstrated
25
26 impact of the initiative which was one of a kind. Leave It delivered a 40% reduction in koala
27
28 deaths from dog attacks (Harris *et al.*, 2022) which gave Queensland Government the
29
30 confidence to refer specifically to Leave It as one of 38 actions in the 2020-2025 Koala
31
32 Conservation Strategy (Queensland Government, 2020).
33
34
35
36
37

38 Today, stakeholders who were first approached in 2016 continue to work with the
39
40 marketing team. The train the trainer model continues. Recently, the Leave It App launched
41
42 a module on barking responding to dog owner and animal management feedback about the
43
44 most common dog owner challenges and source of council complaints. The barking module
45
46 teaches dog owners about prevention of four different types of barking. As of January 2024
47
48 more than 1,700 dog owners have downloaded the App. Partnerships are being created across
49
50 12 local government areas. The first trial of a marketing campaign aimed at raising awareness
51
52 for the dog training App was completed in June 2024. This campaign featured signs at every
53
54 dog park in the local council area. QR code tracking indicates that 89 dog owners went to App
55
56 download page. Materials raising awareness for the free dog training App are now included in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 annual registration materials sent by council. The awareness campaign was supported by a two-
5
6 week online dog training challenge. Survey data demonstrated that 73% of participants had
7
8 either trained their dogs themselves, had basic training, only attended puppy pre-school or had
9
10 no training, hence showing the need for further training initiatives such as Leave It within the
11
12 community. Finally, a targeted social media campaign advertising the App was used. More
13
14 than 100,000 people were reached and campaign tracking demonstrated that 10.2 App
15
16 downloads were occurring daily. Leave It requires the support of the dog training and dog
17
18 owning community. The marketing team are not dog training or wildlife conservation experts,
19
20 and the establishment and maintenance of stakeholder relationships are critical to program
21
22 success. Thousands of stakeholders, including community, are involved in this multi-year
23
24 project led by a team of marketing researchers across the Southeast Queensland corner.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 *C) Tracking outcomes: Understanding what counts.*

33
34 Keeling and Marshall (2022) argue that what we are missing is ‘*wider, especially non-*
35
36 *academic, impact ... brought about, particularly over the medium and long term, and for whom*
37
38 *that impact was valuable*’ (p.2513). The importance of tracking to bring about complex
39
40 outcomes is illustrated through the palliative care context and a current failure in this system
41
42 to capture the unique and various contributions of different stakeholders such as hospitals,
43
44 residential care homes, charities, and social enterprises (the actors). This failure severely
45
46 impacts the ability to make attributions needed to estimate the social return on investment for
47
48 each actor involved in palliative care. Furthermore, this system does not generate performance
49
50 indicators in end-of-life care to understand which forms of palliative care are the most
51
52 impactful.
53
54
55

56
57 As an individual enters the final phase of their life, getting ‘*the care and support they*
58
59 *need, when they need it*’ (Hospice UK, 2023) is, according to the World Health Organisation
60

1
2
3
4 (WHO), only available to 14% of patients globally who need this specialist form of holistic
5
6 treatment, known as palliative care (WHO, 2023). To achieve UN SDG#3, working towards
7
8 universal health coverage through improving health and wellbeing, the WHO states that all
9
10 countries will need to strengthen their palliative care services to address the needs of the 40
11
12 million people globally who are estimated to need palliative care each year (ibid). For this
13
14 situation to change those working in this sector need to understand which forms of palliative
15
16 care are the most impactful. The 'Die Well' work of the UK's Suffolk and North East Essex
17
18 Integrated Care System demonstrates an approach to address the challenge of tracking a range
19
20 of activities to achieve the outcome of an individual experiencing 'a good death' (Borgstrom,
21
22 2016), and the impact of this on those around them.
23
24
25
26

27
28 The intended impacts of palliative care are improved quality of life for a dying person
29
30 through a form of practice which focuses treatment on managing symptoms, offering
31
32 emotional, spiritual, and psychological support, and practical care (Marie Curie, 2023). The
33
34 social value of palliative care is a lasting impact for those who are important to the individual
35
36 who is at the end of their life making this form of care so significant and valuable in improving
37
38 community health and wellbeing (Radbrunch *et al.*, 2020; NICE, 2023). Significant and
39
40 sustainable progression in planning for the provision of more palliative care in England, which
41
42 is considered a global leader in this form of health care, is expected to come through the
43
44 intervention of recent policy. The Health and Care Act 2022 implies a legal duty which in
45
46 practice can be seen by stakeholders such as an Integrated Care Board as guidance to
47
48 commission palliative care services and to '*meet the reasonable requirements of the people for*
49
50 *whom it has responsibility*' (Legislation.gov.uk, 2023). A further challenge to secure outcomes
51
52 can be seen in a recent critical literature review on palliative care policy where Whitelaw *et al.*
53
54 (2022) concluded that whilst policy was '*a necessary condition, in itself, it will probably not*
55
56 *be sufficient to bring about significant and sustainable change*' (2022, p.895). Applying the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Social Impact Pathway requires that the detailed activities and outputs that determine outcomes
5
6 achieved for patients, carers, and families need to be tracked but with this form of care delivered
7
8 locally by a health ecosystem (Sudbury-Riley and Hunter Jones, 2021) comprising many
9
10 stakeholders; tracking and recording can be somewhat inconsistent. A further complication is
11
12 deaths in England are currently recorded by place of occurrence (Nuffield Trust, 2023) and
13
14 benchmarking from measuring the quality and outcomes of care experienced by the dying
15
16 person and those important to them is taken during the last admission leading to death. So
17
18 tracking is complicated by issues in the sector relating to consistent terminology and
19
20 methodology (Jordan *et al.*, 2020) and a system which currently lacks a consistent way to
21
22 record the constituent parts of end-of-life care in England.
23
24
25

26
27
28 Bringing together the full spectrum of partners (or the entire ecosystem) responsible for
29
30 planning and delivering health and care across North East Essex, Ipswich, East Suffolk and
31
32 West Suffolk, the Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care System (ICS) aims *'to ensure*
33
34 *shared leadership and joint action to improve the health and wellbeing of the one million*
35
36 *people who live locally'* (SNEEICS.org.uk, 2024a). Combining the National Health Service,
37
38 local authorities, social care providers, voluntary and community organisations, social
39
40 enterprises; the key stakeholders in a population approach to the collective ambition to enable
41
42 people in North East Essex and Suffolk to *'Die Well – for myself and those close to me as I*
43
44 *reach the end of my life'* (SNEEICS.org.uk, 2024b). Described as an outcome-based approach
45
46 using indicators which are tracked and aligned to an outcome.
47
48
49

50
51 For the two hospices within this Integrated Care System tracking appropriate activities has
52
53 meant developing and hosting an Electronic Palliative Care Coordination System EPaCCS.
54
55 EPaCCS aims to record and share the care preferences of people identified as likely to be in
56
57 the last year of their lives enabling the outcome of *'the right care, in the right place, by the right*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 person, at the right time' (Public Health England, 2014:6) or some of what is considered to
5
6 constitute a 'good death' (Borgstrom and Walter, 2015). For the marketing teams within the
7
8 hospices this has meant carefully promoting EPACCS to a wide range of healthcare
9
10 professionals to ensure participation and information sharing as well as to individuals to
11
12 encourage the necessary sign. After six years of leading a system to elicit and record people's
13
14 preferences for care during their last twelve months, mapping ten outcomes, at the time of
15
16 writing this paper the future of the collaboration and associated funding provided to hospices
17
18 to lead this work and address the gaps in understanding of 'what counts' in palliative care is
19
20 now at risk.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *D) Measuring the impact: Net-positive change over time*

29
30 Impact arises from the accumulation of outcomes. As noted by Ebrahim and Rangan (2014), it
31
32 is not always appropriate for an organisation to measure impact. The impact pathway serves
33
34 as a reminder that intended outcomes first need to be realised and they need outcomes to stack
35
36 up. For organisations failing to deliver positive intended outcomes further reflection is needed
37
38 resulting in changes to practice ensuring outcomes start stacking up. Once outcomes are
39
40 stacking up attempts to measure impact should be made to understand if the outcomes achieved
41
42 are indeed delivering a lasting effect. Each description of impact reflects the accumulation of
43
44 the positive and intended outcomes that arise when individuals interact with an organisation's
45
46 outputs (e.g. events, websites, call services). Utilisation of outcome evaluation allows teams to
47
48 see how many people have changed, if change has occurred as intended, and to assess rates of
49
50 change. Impact pathways will be unique within any one description of impact. Consider the
51
52 following social example. Civic Assist, a charity based in Toowoomba¹, a regional Australian
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹ For detail on Civic Assist see their website - <https://civicassist.org.au/>

1
2
3
4 city, engages with people aged 12-24 years 5,000 times each year. Where appropriate, Civic
5 Assist staff and volunteers provide referrals connecting individuals to specialised support such
6 as health, counselling, housing, and more. An impact assessment, which first requires an
7 understanding of the actions people take following the 5,000 interactions, may explain how
8 reductions in violence occurring on Friday and Saturday nights in the city area are achieved
9 through the services provided by Civic Assist (UN SDG#16 promoting peaceful and inclusive
10 societies). To assess the impact of their programs Civic Assist may illustrate the cost savings
11 to the community from changes observed from implementation of Street Crew.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *E) Engage to learn: Sharing results to showcase best practice*

26
27
28 Public dissemination of the outcomes, impact, and especially the process of social impact
29 projects feeds forward delivering information that investors and decision makers need to decide
30 which activities are worthy of funding. Crucially, it also ensures the stakeholders who engage
31 resources in bringing about change for beneficiaries also benefit from their participation,
32 increasing the chances of the project being extended, repeated, or energy being invested into a
33 new social problem. This is particularly pertinent for commercial organisations investing in
34 corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs. Hildebrand *et al.* (2011) identify employees
35 as one of four key stakeholder groups to play a primary role in shaping how companies manage
36 their societal impact. Waples and Brachle (2020) argue that CSR programs are an important
37 element in attracting the best young talent, a cohort who care deeply about the environment
38 and societal injustices (Narayanan, 2022; Tyson *et al.*, 2011). Put simply, people want to work
39 for companies that take responsibility for their place in the world (De Silva and De Silva
40 Lokuwaduge, 2021).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Programs that are perceived as a bolt-on, where the story of the relationship between non-
5 profit/social marketing activities and the companies are not viewed as authentic and
6 meaningful, risk accusations of greenwashing (Vollero *et al.*, 2016). Bromley and Powell
7 (2012) identify this as an example of decoupling between policy and practice, with two
8 potential forms. The first is where CSR policies are communicated well but not implemented
9 fully. By failing to communicate the net positive these efforts lack credibility. The second is
10 where the CSR programs are not effectively implemented and so lack impact. An additional
11 consideration is when CSR programs are used to offset damaging corporate practices.
12 Corporate practices that degrade the environment, negatively impact biodiversity, or lower
13 people's health and wellbeing cannot continue to go unchecked. Corporations delivering net
14 negative overall through harmful business practices, while communicating a net positive CSR,
15 need to be identified if we are to turn the tide on the wicked problems our world faces.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Social media posts by both customers and activists rapidly identify any discrepancies
32 between corporate words and deeds, which has a moderating effect on claims of internal
33 business practice (e.g., gender pay gaps, diversity recruitment policies) as well as external
34 programs for environmental and social good. This 'calling out' culture reaches all stakeholder
35 groups and has stimulated a significant body of research. Pope and Wæraas (2016) note that
36 calling out is less prevalent in relation to CSR programs than environmental claims on internal
37 business practices. Indeed, the anticipated EU Green Claims Law (Nelson, 2023) will require
38 companies to justify green claims about their products within ten days or face 'effective,
39 proportionate, and dissuasive penalties'. Transparency of reporting key metrics by the
40 companies themselves alleviates employee and shareholder pressure (Weber, 2008) given that
41 what gets measured gets done.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 A strong example of a people programme (internal) that also resonates with customers
57 (external) is family-run retailer Timpsons. Twelve percent of Timpson employees either have
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 a criminal record or are directly recruited from custody, across their 2,000 stores. The company
5 spends £500,000 each year training these ex-offenders. The underpinning motivation is that
6 ex-offenders who find steady jobs within 6 months of leaving prison are nine percentage points
7 less likely to reoffend (Gov.uk, 2023). Action on this issue, given the 14 million people in the
8 UK alone with a criminal record, resonates with UN SDG#8 to promote inclusive and
9 sustainable economic growth, employment, and decent work for all. Re-offending costs the UK
10 £18 billion a year. The impact of this strategy is not just on the individuals offered a second
11 chance but also the company who finds ex-offenders are loyal, hardworking and resilient as
12 well as being cheaper to hire through this recruitment channel. Another outcome for the
13 company has been being invited to work with the UK Government on rolling out Employment
14 Advisory Boards across 90 prisons to ensure prisoners have access to job opportunities when
15 they get out (Gov.uk, 2023). However, there is also considerable evidence that any external
16 activity, such as a CSR program, needs to make sense to a second key stakeholder group - their
17 customers; it needs to fit (Gistri *et al.*, 2019; Bigné, 2012). For customers, the link between
18 social responsibility and perceptions of brand image/corporate image is well established in
19 literature and practice. Iglesias *et al.* (2020) showed that CSR *'influences customer loyalty both*
20 *directly and indirectly through co-creation and customer trust'* (p.151). Islam *et al.* (2021) find
21 that CSR activities are *'significantly and positively associated with corporate reputation,*
22 *customer satisfaction, and customer trust'* (p.123). Xie *et al.* (2019) goes beyond the rational
23 models to explain the role of moral emotions, such as awe and gratitude, and positive attitude
24 in the relationship between CSR programs and customer brand advocacy. Özturan and
25 Grinstein (2022) argue that marketing departments play a key role in ensuring CSR programs
26 resonate with customers and can add value to the role of the department within the broader
27 organisation.

The path forward

The urgent need to turn the tide on fundamental world challenges is recognised and there is no doubt that some effort is underway. For example, growth in third party monitoring and reporting, such as FTSE4Good, Dow Jones Sustainability Index, Thomson Reuters ESG ratings, the Calvert Social Index and lastly CSR Hub, an annual UK index that examines the extent to which responsible business practices are embedded within corporate strategy and operations, are examples of approaches aimed at improving transparency (Parguel *et al.*, 2011). Stakeholder Performance Appraisal processes are another example of approaches that aim to extend performance considerations beyond mere profit considerations to ensure that people and planet are placed at the forefront of performance assessments (Murphy *et al.*, 2005). Popular ratios such as the Social Return on Investment (Zappalà and Lyons, 2009) communicate cost savings to communities. For stakeholders such as customers, employees, and shareholders who value corporate social responsibility and performance, some metrics already exist on which to form judgements about the efficacy and authenticity of activity. The challenge remains whether what is measured is social impact and/or whether impacts are net positive. Barnett *et al.* (2020) reviewed 6,254 articles addressing CSR performance published in the last 50 years. They found the articles overwhelmingly focused on financial performance rather than social impact. The authors cite Margolis and Walsh (2003):

‘Although the financial effects of corporate social performance have been extensively studied, little is known about any other consequences of corporate social initiatives.’
(p.289)

However, they did identify a few studies that addressed outcomes such as green innovations (Lampikoski *et al.*, 2014) and social innovations (Mithani, 2017).

Missing from their findings was evidence of social impact rather than specific outcomes, a focus on specific stakeholder groups rather than wider society. Barnett *et al.* (2020)

1
2
3
4 identify two areas for development. The first is a four-point basis for effective evaluation of
5
6 social impact: containing a base-line comparison, a control group, randomized assignment of
7
8 participant to the CSR program and/or the organisations overall practices and, finally, a
9
10 counterfactual assessment (that is understanding what would have happened to the participants
11
12 if the CSR program or overall organisations activities had not taken place). Secondly, the
13
14 authors identify a key weakness in current design of social impact assessments, namely a
15
16 reliance on large, secondary datasets. They propose an alternative approach that develops
17
18 appropriate measures based on the specific impacts that it seeks to evaluate, labelled small data,
19
20 and consider the unit of analysis needs to be the beneficiaries, not the company, including at a
21
22 community level. This transition enables a true determination of net-positive to be made and
23
24 asks corporations to place, people, and planet at the forefront of all decision making while
25
26 identifying a profitable approach.
27
28
29
30

31
32 This paper extends beyond Keeling and Marshall's (2022) social impact pillars,
33
34 contributing a concrete approach that aims to orient marketing research and practice towards
35
36 transparent reporting of social impact. Moving forward, research that takes an outside-in
37
38 approach, emphasising the perspective of beneficiaries (Benjamin *et al.*, 2023) is recommended
39
40 to lift the fog. When we consider the world's greatest challenges, time is running out. Rates of
41
42 land-clearing, biodiversity loss, mental and chronic health, and violence continue to grow
43
44 unabated. This is concerning given there are finite limits and most, if not all, are preventable.
45
46 Outside-in approaches that describe changes for beneficiaries through outputs arising from the
47
48 activities that organisations invest human time and money into can illuminate how net positive
49
50 change is delivered. This offers an important opportunity for marketing academics to contribute
51
52 to, and be part of, the solution, rather than simply reporting the results.
53
54
55

56
57 Impact can be negative as well as positive. Greenwashing practices provide a veneer for
58
59 organisations to hide behind suggesting that positive actions are being taken when close
60

1
2
3
4 inspection would clearly suggest otherwise. One example is single use plastic recycling, which
5
6 would have many citizens believing packaging placed into recycling streams is being recovered
7
8 when in fact this is not the case. Reports indicate that 16% of single use plastics were recycled
9
10 in Australia in 2021, far short of 70% targets set at the time (Packaging Insights, 2023). These
11
12 statistics suggest all product manufacturers supplying goods using single use plastic should
13
14 focus activities on the reduction, or removal of, single use plastic from supply distribution
15
16 chains to be judged net positive. A further example lies in other environmental claims involving
17
18 tree planting. Close examination of some programs indicates that many tree plantings are
19
20 failing to deliver on environmental targets. For example, mono-culture tree plantings (e.g.,
21
22 pine forests) which financiers and organisations are using to report on carbon targets are
23
24 threatening biodiversity (Aguirre-Gutiérrez *et al.*, 2023). Both marketing researchers and
25
26 practitioners need to consider negative consequences arising from the goods, services and ideas
27
28 they are responsible for. Moving forward, more responsibility needs to be placed on marketing
29
30 professionals. Codes of conduct and professional standards need to be updated, adding the
31
32 competencies needed to improve the accountability of the marketing profession if the world's
33
34 most complex problems are to be solved and trust in our profession is to be regained.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Social impact has largely not been well mapped or understood. More work is urgently
41
42 needed to bring the knowledge, expertise, and evidence of how to map and measure social
43
44 impact. The addition of outcome evaluation skills is needed in the marketing profession along
45
46 with an understanding of appropriate trial methodologies that can be used to deliver the
47
48 definitive evidence needed for impact attributions. Marketers need to avoid assumptions and
49
50 ensure work is grounded in evidence to be able to transparently report net positive changes
51
52 arising from their work. Approaches that extend return on investment beyond financial
53
54 considerations are needed to clearly convey the net positive benefits delivered by organisations.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 A commitment from the marketing profession to deliver net positive will greatly help to regain
5
6 marketing's reputation as a force capable of delivering good.
7

8
9 Moving forward, marketing scholars need to shift research focus to an outside-in
10 approach, emphasising the perspective of beneficiaries (Benjamin, 2021). Inside out
11 approaches fail to deliver the market-oriented approach that underpins marketing practice.
12
13 Philosophically, the marketing function aims to be beneficiary, consumer or customer
14
15 focussed. Involving beneficiaries throughout the entire process, shifts focus from how
16
17 nonprofits are helping beneficiaries, or how commercial organisations are delivering value to
18
19 stakeholders, to a balanced consideration of the consequences both positive and negative, short
20
21 and long-term accumulating from organisational activities. This outside in perspective requires
22
23 a transdisciplinary approach given marketers are not health, social justice or environmental
24
25 experts.
26
27
28
29

30
31 To achieve net-positive impact in marketing, it is essential to grasp the challenges at
32
33 different levels throughout various stages of the mapping process (see Figure 1). We carefully
34
35 reflect each key within the Social Impact Pathway framework, outlining directions for future
36
37 research.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Future research opportunities

Themes	Current state of research	Research questions
A. Problem identification (Q1)	Phenomenon-driven (derived from practice/policy) and aim at closing the gap between social marketing theory and practice policy. Typically, follow UN SDGs and adopt the narrow inside-out approach. Authors used a variety of research methods, data collection instruments, with case studies and interviews, sometimes combined with secondary data. Lack of concrete quantification.	How to build a shared vision on the intervention scope especially from an outside in approach? What are the specific situations facing beneficiaries to focus on? How do collective actors think and feel about the issue and barriers? What have they tried in the past? What worked? What failed? How to design and support intervention initiatives that bring researchers and stakeholders together? What types of 'hard' and 'soft' data would be useful to collect to enable change? What are the new variables and relationships to build theoretical insights?
B. Stakeholder collaboration (Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5)	A shift from academic driven to multiple-actor approach. The need for a highly participatory approach.	How to strengthen multi-stakeholder capacity; and liaise with public policy? How to work with community, businesses and NGOs? Decide on what changes that matter. Collaboratively choose changes that they want to bring about (motivation) Which actors would do what differently? (e.g., motivation, capacity, contexts, obstacles, opportunities) How can new strategies overcome obstacles? What are the desirable and appropriate intervention strategies?
C. Tracking outputs and outcomes (Q6)	The tension between short vs long term approach to interventions. Ethics of impact.	How to consolidate outcomes and establish causal links about the explicit assumption? How to translate impact pathway into intervention action plan? What are the moral dimensions of decision making and implementation processes to promote responsible and positive contribution to society?
D. Measuring impact (Q7)	The impact is a result of the cumulative actions and outputs, encompassing the engagements between organisations and individuals, along with the subsequent changes that transpire after these interactions.	How to support the cumulative action and outputs in order to scale up? And how can efforts be sustained over time? How to enable wider impact process and interactions; and achieve the intended and unintended global dialogue and partnership?
E. Engaging to learn (Q8)	Building on engagement and reflective approach; focus on long-term impact processes.	What are the most effective communication tools, such as storytelling? How can an interactive and reflexive process be sustained to maintain consistency in research interventions? What are potential new research questions that could enhance the impact process? In what ways can the continuous development of new insights, innovation, and change processes be facilitated? When navigating complexity, how should the researcher's role be reconsidered and questioned from an ethical perspective?

Conclusion

This paper extends the five pillars of impact recommended by Keeling and Marshall (2022) by providing a comprehensive framework that can be applied to map organisational activities to improve transparency and direct organisational efforts to the delivery of net positive. We anticipate that the Social Impact Pathway framework will be helpful in guiding marketing researchers and practitioners with an interest in net positive social impact. Moreover, we expect this framework to emphasise the necessary capabilities for addressing measurement challenges. These challenges involve both the integration of an outside-in approach, incorporating beneficiaries and experts from other disciplines into the entire project lifecycle from design to end-of-product life. Collective efforts are also needed to address the world's most complex problems.

To achieve this, it is essential to untangle the role of each organisation and carefully consider how impact arises from cumulative outcomes flowing from any organisation's activities. The marketing profession needs to take a proactive stance, necessitating a revision of Training approaches and codes of conduct. These revisions should encompass the competencies needed to deliver net-positive impact. These must also emphasise cross-sector collaborations to bridge knowledge gaps between sectors. Comprehensive approaches needed to address the challenges faced by our most vulnerable populations and the environment should be integrated into marketing's core functions. Furthermore, marketing academics need to actively engage in social change projects instead of solely focusing on publishing results. Sharing insights on the process, challenges and the net-positive change mechanism enables other projects to learn and build upon those experiences. This shift also empowers researchers to make a concrete positive difference in the world.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Aguirre-Gutiérrez, J., Stevens, N. and Berenguer, E. (2023), “Valuing the functionality of
7
8 tropical ecosystems beyond carbon”, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, Vol. 38, No. 12, pp.
9
10 1109-1111.
11
12
13 Banke-Thomas, A.O., Madaj, B., Charles, A. *et al.* (2015), “Social Return on Investment (SROI)
14
15 methodology to account for value for money of public health interventions: a systematic
16
17 review”, *BMC Public Health* Vol. 15, pp.1-14.
18
19
20 Barnett, M.L., Henriques, I. and Husted, B.W. (2020), “Beyond good intentions: Designing CSR
21
22 initiatives for greater social impact”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 46 No. 6, pp.937-964.
23
24
25 Benjamin, L.M. (2021), “Bringing beneficiaries more centrally into nonprofit management
26
27 education and research”, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No.1, pp.5-26.
28
29
30 Benjamin, L.M., Ebrahim, A. and Gugerty, M.K. (2023), “Nonprofit Organizations and the
31
32 Evaluation of Social Impact: A Research Program to Advance Theory and Practice”,
33
34 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 52 No.1, pp.313-352.
35
36
37 Bigné, E., Currás-Pérez, R. and Aldás-Manzano, J. (2012), “Dual nature of cause-brand fit:
38
39 Influence on corporate social responsibility consumer perception”, *European Journal of*
40
41 *Marketing*, Vol. 46 No.3/4, pp.575-594.
42
43
44 Borgstrom, E., and Walter, T. (2015), “Choice and compassion at the end of life: A critical
45
46 analysis of recent English policy discourse”, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol 136/137,
47
48 pp.99-105.
49
50
51 Bromley, P. and Powell, W.W. (2012), “From smoke and mirrors to walking the talk:
52
53 Decoupling in the contemporary world”, *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 6 No.1,
54
55 pp.483-530.
56
57
58 Chandy, R. K., Johar, G. V., Moorman, C., & Roberts, J. H. (2021), “Better marketing for a
59
60 better world”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol 85 No. 3, pp.1-9.

- 1
2
3
4 Clark, C. and Rosenzweig, W. (2004), “Double Bottom Line Project Report”, University of
5
6 California, Berkeley, CA.
7
- 8 David, P. Rundle-Thiele, S.R., Pang, B., Knox, K., Parkinson, J and Hussenoeder, F. (2019),
9
10 “Engaging the dog owner community in the design of an effective koala aversion program.”,
11
12 *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 55-68.
13
14
- 15 De Silva, K. M. and De Silva Lokuwaduge, C. S. (2021), “Impact of corporate social
16
17 responsibility practices on employee commitment”, *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol. 17
18
19 No. 1, pp.1-14.
20
21
- 22 Delistavrou, A., Krystallis, A., & Tilikidou, I. (2020), “Consumers’ decision to boycott
23
24 “unethical” products: The role of materialism/post materialism”, *International Journal of*
25
26 *Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 48 No. 10, pp.1121-1138
27
28
- 29 Dufour, D. (2020), “Scope’s rebrand journey to set themselves apart as Disability
30
31 Gamechangers”, CharityComms, available at: [https://www.charitycomms.org.uk/scopes-](https://www.charitycomms.org.uk/scopes-rebrand-journey-to-set-themselves-apart-as-disability-gamechangers)
32
33 [rebrand-journey-to-set-themselves-apart-as-disability-gamechangers](https://www.charitycomms.org.uk/scopes-rebrand-journey-to-set-themselves-apart-as-disability-gamechangers) (accessed 10 May
34
35 2023).
36
37
- 38 Dwivedi, Y. K., Jeyaraj, A., Hughes, L., Davies, G. H., Ahuja, M., Albashrawi, M. A., ... &
39
40 Walton, P. (2024), ““Real impact””: Challenges and opportunities in bridging the gap
41
42 between research and practice—Making a difference in industry, policy, and society”,
43
44 *International Journal of Information Management*, 102750.
45
46
- 47 Ebrahim, A. and Rangan, V.K. (2014), “What Impact? A Framework for Measuring the Scale
48
49 and Scope of Social Performance” *California Management Review*, Vol. 56 No.3, pp. 118–
50
51 141.
52
53
- 54 Gov.uk (2023), “Thousands more ex-prisoners in work”, available at:
55
56 [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thousands-more-ex-prisoners-in-work-following-](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thousands-more-ex-prisoners-in-work-following-major-drive-to-boost-employment)
57
58 [major-drive-to-boost-employment](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thousands-more-ex-prisoners-in-work-following-major-drive-to-boost-employment) (accessed 01 March 2024).
59
60

1
2
3
4 Gov.uk (2013), "Achieving social impact at scale", available at:

5
6 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/achieving-social-impact-at-scale> (accessed 01
7
8 March 2024).

9
10 Gistri, G., Corciolani, M., and Pace, S. (2019), "Does the perception of incongruence hurt more?
11
12 Customers' responses to CSR crises affecting the main reputation dimension of a
13
14 company", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 35 No. 7-8, pp.605-633.

15
16
17 Harris, J., Rundle-Thiele, S.R., David, P. and Pang, B. (2021), "Engaging dog trainers in a city-
18
19 wide rollout of koala aversion skill enhancement: A social marketing program," *Australasian*
20
21 *Journal of Environmental Management*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 236-247.

22
23
24 Harrison-Byrne, T. (2023), "Good Cop, Bad Cop: How environmental charities can take
25
26 advantage of direct action", NFP Research, available at: [https://nfpresearch.com/blog/good-](https://nfpresearch.com/blog/good-cop-bad-cop)
27
28 [cop-bad-cop](https://nfpresearch.com/blog/good-cop-bad-cop) (accessed 20 April 2023).

29
30
31 Hildebrand, D., Sen, S. and Bhattacharya, C.B. (2011), "Corporate social responsibility: a
32
33 corporate marketing perspective", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 45 No. 9/10,
34
35 pp.1353-1364.

36
37
38 Hospice UK (2023), available at: <https://www.hospiceuk.org> (accessed 10 May 2023)

39
40
41 Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Bagherzadeh, M. and Singh, J. J. (2020), "Co-creation: A key link
42
43 between corporate social responsibility, customer trust, and customer loyalty", *Journal of*
44
45 *Business Ethics*, Vol. 163, pp.151-166.

46
47
48 Ingram, R., Skinner, S. J., & Taylor, V. A. (2005), "Consumers' evaluation of unethical
49
50 marketing behaviors: The role of customer commitment", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.
51
52 62, pp.237-252.

53
54
55 Isbanner, S., Carins, J. and Rundle-Thiele, S.R. (2022), "Healthy Eats—Evaluation of a Social
56
57 Marketing Program Delivered in Primary School Settings in Queensland." *International*
58
59 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 19, p.14415.
60

- 1
2
3
4 Islam, T., Islam, R., Pitafi, A.H., Xiaobei, L., Rehmani, M. *et al.* (2021), “The impact of
5
6 corporate social responsibility on customer loyalty: The mediating role of corporate
7
8 reputation, customer satisfaction, and trust”, *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, Vol.
9
10 25, pp.123-135.
- 11
12 Izzo, D. (2013), “Aligning interests in impact investing”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*,
13
14 available at: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/aligning_interests_in_impact_investing# (accessed
15
16 20 April 2023).
- 17
18
19 Jordan, R.I., Allsop, M.J. and El Mokhallalati, Y. (2020), “Duration of palliative care before
20
21 death in international routine practice: a systematic review and meta-analysis”, *BMC*
22
23 *Medicine* 18, pp.1-25.
- 24
25
26 Kanter, R.M. and Summers, D.V. (1987), “Doing well while doing good: Dilemmas of
27
28 performance measurement in nonprofit organizations and the need for a multiple constituency
29
30 approach”, W. Powell (Ed.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Yale University
31
32 Press, Newhaven, CT., pp.154–166.
- 33
34
35 Kaplan, S., (2020), “Why social responsibility produces more resilient organizations”, *MIT*
36
37 *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp.85-90.
- 38
39
40 Keeling, D. I., Keeling, K., de Ruyter, K., and Laing, A. (2021), “How value co-creation and co-
41
42 destruction unfolds: a longitudinal perspective on dialogic engagement in health services
43
44 interactions.”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 49, pp. 236-257.
- 45
46
47 Keeling, D.I. and Marshall, G.W. (2022), “A call for impact! Launch of the new impact article”,
48
49 *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56 No. 9, pp.2509-2514.
- 50
51
52 Keith, D., Taylor, L., Paine, J., Weisbach, R. and Dowidowicz, A. (2022), “When funders aren’t
53
54 customers: Reputation management and capability underinvestment in multiaudience
55
56 organizations”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 0 No. 0, <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2022.1579>.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Kirk-Wade, E. (2022), "UK disability statistics: Prevalence and life experiences", House of
5
6 Commons Library, available at:
7
8 <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9602/CBP-9602.pdf> (accessed
9
10 26 April 2023).
- 11
12
13 Lampikoski, T., Westerlund, M., Rajala, R. and Moller, K. (2014), "Green Innovation Games:
14
15 Value-creation strategies for corporate sustainability", *California Management Review*, Vol.
16
17 57 No.1, pp.88-116.
- 18
19
20 Lee, Z. and Davies, I. (2021), "Navigating relative invariance: Perspectives on corporate
21
22 heritage identity and organizational heritage identity in an evolving nonprofit institution",
23
24 *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.129, pp.813-825.
- 25
26
27 Lee, Z., Spry, A., Ekinici, Y. and Vredenburg, J., (2023), "From warmth to warrior: Impacts of
28
29 non-profit brand activism on brand bravery, brand hypocrisy and brand equity", *Journal of*
30
31 *Brand Management*, pp.1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-023-00319-8>
- 32
33
34 Legislation.gov.uk (2023). "Health and Care Act 2022", available at:
35
36 [https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/31/part/1/crossheading/integrated-care-boards-](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/31/part/1/crossheading/integrated-care-boards-functions/enacted)
37
38 [functions/enacted](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/31/part/1/crossheading/integrated-care-boards-functions/enacted) (accessed 29 May 2023).
- 39
40
41 Lim, W. M., O'Connor, P., Nair, S., Soleimani, S., & Rasul, T. (2023), "A foundational theory
42
43 of ethical decision-making: The case of marketing professionals", *Journal of Business*
44
45 *Research*, Vol. 158, pp.113579.
- 46
47
48 Margolis, J.D. and Walsh, J.P. (2003), "Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by
49
50 business", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp.268-305.
- 51
52 Marie Curie, (2023), Palliative care zone, available at:
53
54 <https://www.mariecurie.org.uk/professionals/palliative-care-knowledge-zone> (accessed 10th
55
56 May 2023).
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Mirzaei, A., Webster, C.M. and Siuki, H. (2021), "Exploring brand purpose dimensions for non-
5
6 profit organizations", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 28, pp.186-198.
7
- 8 Mitchell, S.L. and Clark, M. (2021) "Telling a different story: How nonprofit organizations
9
10 reveal strategic purpose through storytelling", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 38 No.1,
11
12 pp.142-158.
13
- 14 Mithani, M.A. (2017), "Innovation and CSR - Do They Go Well Together? ", *Long Range*
15
16 *Planning*, Vol. 50 No. 6, pp.699-711.
17
- 18 Murphy, B., Maguiness, P., Pescott, C., Wislang, S., Ma, J. and Wang, R. (2005), "Stakeholder
19
20 perceptions presage holistic stakeholder relationship marketing performance", *European*
21
22 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 39 No. 9/10, pp.1049-1059.
23
24
- 25 Narayanan, S. (2022), "Does Generation Z value and reward corporate social responsibility
26
27 practices?", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 38 No. 9-10, pp.903-937.
28
29
- 30 Nelson, A. (2023), "EU to crack down on greenwashing with 'proportionate penalties'", *The*
31
32 *Guardian*, available at: [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/feb/28/eu-to-crack-](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/feb/28/eu-to-crack-down-on-greenwashing-with-proportionate-penalties)
33
34 [down-on-greenwashing-with-proportionate-penalties](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/feb/28/eu-to-crack-down-on-greenwashing-with-proportionate-penalties) (accessed 17 May 2023).
35
36
- 37 NICE (2023), "NICE impact end of life care for adults", available at:
38
39 [https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/into-practice/measuring-the-use-of-nice-](https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/into-practice/measuring-the-use-of-nice-guidance/impact-of-our-guidance/nice-impact-end-of-life-care-for-adults)
40
41 [guidance/impact-of-our-guidance/nice-impact-end-of-life-care-for-adults](https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/into-practice/measuring-the-use-of-nice-guidance/impact-of-our-guidance/nice-impact-end-of-life-care-for-adults) (accessed 10 May
42
43 2023)
44
45
- 46 Nuffield Trust (2023), "End of life care", available at:
47
48 <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/end-of-life-care> (accessed 20 April 2023).
49
50
- 51 Özturan, P., & Grinstein, A. (2022), "Can the marketing department benefit from socially
52
53 responsible marketing activities? The role of legitimacy and customers' interest in social
54
55 responsibility", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56 No.2, pp.400-441.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Packaging Insights (2023), "Australia raises recycling targets to 80% by 2030 amid pollution
5 scourge.", available at [https://www.packaginginsights.com/news/australia-raises-recycling-](https://www.packaginginsights.com/news/australia-raises-recycling-and-reduction-targets-to-80-by-2030-amid-pollution-scourge.html)
6 [and-reduction-targets-to-80-by-2030-amid-pollution-scourge.html](https://www.packaginginsights.com/news/australia-raises-recycling-and-reduction-targets-to-80-by-2030-amid-pollution-scourge.html) (accessed 19th March
7
8
9
10 2024).
- 11
12
13 Parguel, B., Benoît-Moreau, F. and Larceneux, F. (2011), "How sustainability ratings might
14
15 deter 'greenwashing': A closer look at ethical corporate communication", *Journal of Business*
16
17 *Ethics*, Vol. 102, pp.15-28.
- 18
19
20 Pathak, P. and Dattani, P. (2014), "Social return on investment: Three technical challenges",
21
22 *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 10, pp.91-104.
- 23
24
25 Pope, S. and Wæraas, A. (2016), "CSR-washing is rare: A conceptual framework, literature
26
27 review, and critique", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 137, pp.173-193.
- 28
29
30 Public Health England (2014), "Electronic Palliative Care Co-ordination Systems (EPaCCS) in
31
32 England", available at:
33
34 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5d65143a40f0b607c4babaf8/EPaCCS_Survey](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5d65143a40f0b607c4babaf8/EPaCCS_Survey_Summary_Report_Final_25_04_14.pdf)
35
36 [_Summary_Report_Final_25_04_14.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5d65143a40f0b607c4babaf8/EPaCCS_Survey_Summary_Report_Final_25_04_14.pdf) (accessed 28th February 2024).
- 37
38
39 Queensland Government (2020), "South East Queensland Koala Conservation Strategy (2020-
40
41 2025).", available at
42
43 [https://environment.des.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/211732/seq-koala-](https://environment.des.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/211732/seq-koala-conservation-strategy-2020-2025.pdf)
44
45 [conservation-strategy-2020-2025.pdf](https://environment.des.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/211732/seq-koala-conservation-strategy-2020-2025.pdf) (accessed 19th March 2024).
- 46
47
48 Radbruch, L., De Lima, L., Knaul, F., Wenk, R., Ali, Z. *et al.* (2020), "Redefining palliative
49
50 care-A new consensus-based definition", *Journal of Pain Symptom Management*, Vol. 60 No.
51
52 4, pp.754-764.
- 53
54
55 Rundle-Thiele, S.R., Pang, B., Knox, K., David, P. Parkinson, J. and Hussenöeder, F. (2019),
56
57 "Generating new directions for managing dog and koala interactions: A social marketing
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 formative research study," *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management*, Vol. 26,
5
6 No. 2, pp. 173-187.
7

8 Rundle-Thiele, S.R. (2022), "A reflection on motivating community action to protect an
9
10 endangered species using marketing.", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56, No. 9, pp.
11
12 2558-2572.
13

14
15 SCOPE (2022), "Scope Annual Report", available at: [https://www.scope.org.uk/about-](https://www.scope.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/)
16
17 [us/annual-report/](https://www.scope.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/) (accessed 20 April 2023).
18

19
20 Sfdora.org (2012), "San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment", available at:
21
22 <https://sfdora.org/read/> (accessed 01 March 2024).
23

24
25 SNEEICS (2024a), "Can do health and care. Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care
26
27 System", available at: <https://www.sneeics.org.uk/> (accessed 24 February 2024).
28

29
30 SNEEICS (2024b), "Our collective ambition: Live well", <https://www.sneeics.org.uk/live-well/>
31
32 (accessed 24 February 2024).
33

34
35 Social Impact Investment Taskforce (2014), "Measuring impact: Subject paper of the impact
36
37 measurement working group", *UK Presidency of the G8*.
38

39
40 Sudbury-Riley, L & Hunter-Jones, P. (2021), "Facilitating inter-professional integration in
41
42 palliative care: A service ecosystem perspective", *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 277,
43
44 113912.
45

46
47 Treasury.gov.au (2023), "Australian social impact treasury task force - final report", available
48
49 at: [https://treasury.gov.au/publication/p2023-](https://treasury.gov.au/publication/p2023-391009#:~:text=The%20Social%20Impact%20Investing%20)
50
51 [391009#:~:text=The%20Social%20Impact%20Investing%20](https://treasury.gov.au/publication/p2023-391009#:~:text=The%20Social%20Impact%20Investing%20) (accessed 24 March 2024).
52

53
54 Tyson, A., Kennedy, B. and Funk, C. (2021), "Gen Z, Millennials stand out for climate change
55
56 activism, social media engagement with issues", *Pew Research Center*, Vol. 26 (May).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 UKRI (2024), "How research England supports research excellence", available at:

5
6 [https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/research-england/research-excellence/
8 framework/](https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/research-england/research-excellence/research-excellence-
7 framework/) (accessed 24 March 2024).
9

10 Vollero, A., Palazzo, M., Siano, A. and Elving, W.J. (2016), "Avoiding the greenwashing trap:
11 between CSR communication and stakeholder engagement", *International Journal of*
12 *Innovation and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp.120-140.
13
14

15
16
17 Wainwright, S. (2002), "Measuring impact: A guide to resources", NCVO: London.
18

19
20 Waples, C.J. and Brachle, B.J. (2020), "Recruiting millennials: Exploring the impact of CSR
21 involvement and pay signalling on organizational attractiveness", *Corporate Social*
22 *Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp.870-880.
23
24

25
26
27 Weber, M. (2008), "The business case for corporate social responsibility: A company-level
28 measurement approach for CSR", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp.247-
29 261.
30
31

32
33
34 Whitelaw, A., Bell, A. and Clark, D. (2022), "The expression of 'policy' in palliative care: A
35 critical review", *Health Policy*, Vol. 126 No. 9, pp.889-898.
36
37

38
39 WHO (2023), "Palliative care", available at: <https://www.who.int/health-topics/palliative-care>
40 (accessed 20 April 2023).
41

42
43 Xie, C., Bagozzi, R. P. and Grønhaug, K. (2019), "The impact of corporate social responsibility
44 on consumer brand advocacy: The role of moral emotions, attitudes, and individual
45 differences" *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 95, pp.514-530.
46
47

48
49 Zappalà, G. and Lyons, M. (2009), "Recent approaches to measuring impact in the Third Sector:
50 An overview", *The Centre for Social Impact*, No. 9 (July).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
