



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

“Smoking Is Sóóó ... Sandals and White Socks”

Co-Creation of a Dutch Anti-Smoking Campaign to Change Social Norms

van den Heerik, R.A.M.; van Hooijdonk, C.M.J.; Burgers, C.; Steen, G.J.

DOI

[10.1080/10410236.2016.1168000](https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2016.1168000)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Health Communication

License

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van den Heerik, R. A. M., van Hooijdonk, C. M. J., Burgers, C., & Steen, G. J. (2017). “Smoking Is Sóóó ... Sandals and White Socks”: Co-Creation of a Dutch Anti-Smoking Campaign to Change Social Norms. *Health Communication*, 32(7), 621-628. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2016.1168000>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

“Smoking Is Sóóó ... Sandals and White Socks”: Co-Creation of a Dutch Anti-Smoking Campaign to Change Social Norms

Romy A. M. van den Heerik^a, Charlotte M. J. van Hooijdonk^b, Christian Burgers^c, and Gerard J. Steen^a

^aDepartment of Dutch Studies, University of Amsterdam; ^bDepartment of Language, Literature and Communication, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam; ^cDepartment of Communication Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

ABSTRACT

This article considers co-creation as a new persuasive strategy in health campaigns. Co-creation enables target audience members to become active campaign producers. A recent Dutch anti-smoking campaign applied co-creation, inviting the target audience to complete the slogan “smoking is sóóó . . .” with something outdated on social networking sites (SNSs) like Facebook and Twitter to stress non-smoking as the new social norm. From a corpus-linguistic perspective, we investigated how the slogans from the target audience resonated with or deviated from the campaign’s original message. In general, the target audience slogans followed the campaign’s approach, but on the SNSs, differences were found regarding the valence, type of utterance, and domain to which smoking was compared. The target audience frequently compared smoking with other (inter)personal social norms. Co-creation thus provides the target audience with an opportunity to disseminate campaign messages from their own perspective, but at the same time a co-creation strategy risks diluting the intended campaign message.

Tobacco smoking is the second major cause of death worldwide. Every year, approximately six million people die because of smoking-related diseases, and 85% of the adults who smoke started smoking during adolescence (World Health Organization, 2014). In the Netherlands, a third of the adolescents between the ages of 15 and 24 years have tried their first cigarette, despite the well-known health risks of smoking. Of them, 9% smokes occasionally, and 17% is even a daily smoker (Trimbos-instituut, 2014). Once addicted, these young people will likely be steady cigarette consumers for many years (World Health Organization, 2014). This means that adolescents are an at-risk population for this health threat.

Classic anti-smoking campaigns have aimed to persuade their audience by using fear appeals: scary texts or images to warn off the dangers of smoking. A recent overview by Ruiter, Kessels, Peters, and Kok (2014), however, shows that such fear appeals are often ineffective, leading to a call for alternative methods of health behavior change. In this article, we answer that call by focusing on a new persuasive strategy: co-creation.

When the public engages in co-creation, it is not a passive receiver but participates actively in the creation of value (i.e., an idea, a product, testing, promotion, self-revelation, and so forth), often at the behest of organizations (Zwass, 2010). Little is known about how co-creation exactly works in health campaigns. However, co-creation has been frequently applied and extensively studied in the context of commercial marketing (cf. Bacile, Ye, & Swilley, 2014; Gebauer, Fuller, & Pezzej, 2013; Zwass, 2010). Companies, for example, ask consumers to define and solve problems together during active dialogues,

which eventually leads to a co-created product (Pralhad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Consequently, advantages of co-creation are reducing costs, improving the product, gaining time, getting to know the consumer, and strengthening the consumer-company relationship (Hoyer, Chandy, Dorotic, Krafft, & Singh, 2010).

Co-creation causes a shift from campaign-controlled to consumer-contributed health campaigns and comes with opportunities and pitfalls (Gebauer et al., 2013). A possible advantage of a co-created health campaign is that campaign messages are (co-)constructed by the target audience, involving the target audience in creating the campaign and giving them the possibility to show interest in the health issue. Eventually, the target audience could get the impression that the message comes from peers rather than an abstract organization, which could boost the impact of the campaign. At the same time, co-creation can have negative effects when consumers deviate from the intended campaign message or even turn against the campaign by taking up an opposite position toward the health issue. This causes the risk of losing the campaign message (Gebauer et al., 2013).

The question remains how co-creation actually works in health campaigns and whether it will help boost the impact of a campaign or if the negative effects of co-creation will prevail. The goal of this study is to show how a target audience co-creates a health campaign and whether co-creation is an appropriate new strategy to apply in anti-smoking campaigns to reinforce campaign messages. Therefore, we investigate from a corpus-linguistic perspective how contributions from target

audience members who co-create an anti-smoking campaign resonate with or deviate from the campaign message. First, we give an overview of relevant theories for the study of co-creation in health campaigns followed by a description of our case study, the Dutch “Smoking is so outdated” health campaign.

Theoretical Framework

One of the ways in which public health campaigns can achieve behavioral change is by focusing on changing existing social norms (Bandura, 2004). These norms consist of implicit or explicit rules that a group uses for (in)appropriate values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, including health behavior. Social-norm campaigns often intend to reduce problem behaviors by conveying the message that deleterious behaviors are socially disapproved of (Schultz, Nolan, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Giskevicius, 2007). By creating social-learning environments, these campaigns aim to convince target audience members that their social norms need to be adjusted, which should eventually result in behavioral change (Baelden, van Audenhove & Verganani, 2012). Social cognitive theory (SCT; Bandura, 2004) explains that learning occurs in a social context and that much of what is learned is gained through modeling the behavior of someone with whom you can identify. In this line of reasoning, groups of interconnected people stop smoking in concert, eventually socially marginalizing the people who remain smoking (Christakis & Fowler, 2008).

To create social-learning environments, the encouragement of interpersonal communication is an important objective in social-norm campaigns (van den Putte, Yzer, Southwell, de Bruijn, & Willemsen, 2011). Interpersonal communication offers a context for social learning to take place and stimulates behavioral change because people tend to evaluate messages from others as more credible and convincing than messages from government institutes (Renes et al., 2011). It thus works as an independent information channel where peers can learn from each other, mediating the relation between campaigns and health behavior (Seo & Matsaganis, 2013). As a result, interpersonal communication has been found to heighten the impact of health campaigns for health behaviors ranging from condom use (Rimal, Limaye, Roberts, Brown, & Mkandawire, 2013) to smoking cessation (van den Putte et al., 2011). Moreover, it also causes a substantial number of audience members who are not directly exposed to the campaign to still be indirectly exposed through communication with people who have seen the campaign, thereby disseminating the health campaign’s message (van den Putte et al., 2011). Accordingly, interpersonal communication about health information can influence health behaviors beyond intervention or campaign contexts (Seo & Matsaganis, 2013).

Besides talking about the health issue, conversational valence (i.e., how negatively or positively people speak about health issues) also influences predictors of health behaviors (Hendriks, van den Putte, & de Bruijn, 2014). This conversational valence can in turn be affected by health messages: a study on binge drinking, for instance, shows that health-message exposure indirectly affects intentions to refrain from binge drinking through negative conversational valence (Hendriks, de Bruijn, & van den Putte, 2012). Usually, health

campaigns prompt people to talk negatively about unhealthy behaviors. Nonetheless, the question arises whether the target audience will also take up this negative conversational valence in their conversations about the unhealthy behavior when health campaigns let the target audience co-create the campaign. This leads to the following research question:

RQ1: How does the conversational valence as introduced by the target audience resonate with or deviate from the campaigns’ conversational valence toward the proposed health behavior?

Health campaigns can promote interpersonal communication and subsequent change of social norms by using co-creation and, more specifically, by inviting the target audience to co-construct a slogan. In this way, a health campaign can produce the first words of a sentence that enables the target audience to produce the remainder of the sentence. As soon as a co-constructed sentence is established, not only does the first fragment become an environment for the second, capable of shaping its implicated meaning, but likewise the second fragment creates a new context for the first, potentially unfixing its former meaning and giving it a new one: “backframing” (Du Bois, 2014). The open-ended character of language guarantees that the potential for engagement in co-constructing a sentence will be limitless, or at least that it cannot be delimited in advance (Du Bois, 2014). This makes it easy and interesting for a target audience to co-construct a slogan. It provides the target audience with a script to talk about the health issue in their own way, mediated by cultural context: practices, norms, and meanings (Akaka, Schau, & Vargo, 2013).

We can distinguish two types of contributions that a target audience can provide when engaging in the co-construction of a sentence: presupposed resonant contributions and creative resonant contributions (Du Bois, 2014). Presupposed resonant contributions build deductively on preexisting (campaign) sources. Here, linguistic elements from the target audience resonate with elements from a prior (campaign) utterance. Creative resonant contributions concern a more novel kind of resonance, with characteristics that are discovered or even created in the process of resonance production. Cases of novel resonance can be considered creative or deviant in that they generate new understandings and possibilities. Among cases of creative resonance, some will be used by a broader discourse community, whereas others will be used only by the participants of the current community (this is especially the case when using humor or irony; Du Bois, 2014). Therefore, the research question is as follows:

RQ2: How does the target audience co-construct a slogan about a health issue, and how does this correspond to or deviate from the way the campaign formulates these slogans?

Nowadays, interpersonal communication often takes place online (Baelden et al., 2012). Microblogging, for example, is a frequently used online tool for customer word of mouth (the process of conveying information from person to person) for sharing opinions about brands (Jansen, Zhang, Sobel, & Chowdury, 2009). Moreover, with the rise of social networking sites (SNSs, e.g., Facebook, Twitter), the use of co-creation

has been made easier. These sites provide unlimited means for Internet users to consume, contribute, and create content (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011).

Consumers engage differently in co-creation on distinct social media channels (Smith, Fischer, & Yongjian, 2012). For example, Facebook and Twitter feature more negative sentiment than YouTube regarding brand-related user-generated content. Content on Twitter is also less likely to feature consumer self-promotion than on Facebook. Furthermore, people often use Twitter to engage in discussions and spread news. Arguably, a target audience engages differently in the co-creation of a health campaign depending on the SNS. This leads to our third research question, focusing on different SNS:

RQ3a: How does the target audience co-create on Twitter?

RQ3b: How does the target audience co-create on Facebook?

Method

Case

The Dutch health campaign “Smoking is so outdated” (*Roken kan echt niet meer*) serves as a case study to answer our research questions. The campaign was initiated by the Dutch Cancer Society, ran from 2012 to 2014 and focused on young non-smokers from 15 to 25 years. The campaign stressed that smoking is old-fashioned and intended to establish non-smoking as the new social norm. Campaign ads introduced slogans that started with “smoking is sóóó” and were endorsed by Dutch celebrities, included pictures of adolescents or a general corresponding background. An example of a campaign slogan is: “smoking is sóóó sandals and white socks.” The campaign was distributed through mass media and online SNSs.

The campaign used a specific type of co-creation in that, during the campaign’s run time, the public could voluntarily contribute to the campaign by posting their own slogans on SNSs, to share their views on smoking with the rest of the world. Young non-smokers were asked to participate in the campaign by formulating their own slogan starting with the words “smoking is sóóó.” In this way, the target audience was provided with a script to make their own perspective on smoking explicit and to elicit interpersonal communication about smoking. On Twitter, audience members could post any slogan using the official hashtag #rokenkanechtnietmeer [#smokingissooutdated]. On Facebook, the campaign served as gatekeeper, posting pictures of slogans that were created by adolescents on various festivals on the Facebook page <https://www.facebook.com/KWFKankerbestrijding>. While the slogans on Twitter and Facebook have been published in a different way, with and without gatekeeper, the comparison of the slogans on the two SNSs does show how these different co-creation routes lead to different slogans.

Materials

We collected a total of 441 slogans from the campaign and slogans co-created by the target audience. These were all the slogans that were to be found online on the campaign website,

Facebook and Twitter in July 2014. First, 79 campaign slogans from advertisements and television commercials were collected from the campaign website www.rokenkanechtnietmeer.nl and the corresponding Facebook and Twitter pages. Besides, 362 slogans were collected that were co-constructed by the target audience. On the Facebook page of the campaign, <https://www.facebook.com/KWFKankerbestrijding>, 229 slogans were collected. Finally, 133 slogans made by the target audience on Twitter were collected using the official Dutch hashtag #rokenkanechtnietmeer [#smokingissooutdated].

Procedure

Using corpus-linguistic analysis, we derived the following coding categories from the data: conversational valence, type of utterance, and the domain that smoking was compared with. We first looked at the conversational valence of the collected slogans and examined whether smoking was compared with something with a positive or negative connotation. To do this as objectively as possible, we annotated a slogan as having a positive or negative valence only when the words used in the slogan made this valence explicit. We therefore looked for words that had a clear positive or negative connotation (positive: “good,” “winning,” and “decent”; negative: “bad,” “bully,” and “stealing”). Moreover, we analyzed whether the slogans included any form of negation (“not,” “never”) to indicate that smoking was being compared with something negative. We also looked at emoticons (☺/☹) and punctuation marks (. . .).

The linguistic construction of “smoking is sóóó. . .” aimed for a comparison, such as “smoking is sóóó floppy disk.” However, two other structural options turned out to be possible too. Therefore, slogans were marked as a comparison when smoking was compared with something tangible from outside the smoking domain, for example, “smoking is sóóó sandals and white socks.” Slogans were marked for metonymy when a comparison was made, not with something specific, but with something associated in meaning with that thing or concept, like a year or period of time that stands for something or all the things that happened during that time (“smoking is sóóó 1900”). Slogans were marked for attribution when smoking was not compared with something else but instead explicitly evaluated, often using an adjective, for example, “bad,” “stinky,” “expensive.” In sum, we analyzed whether the slogans included a comparison, a metonymy, or an attribution.

Finally, for the comparisons, we annotated the domain to which smoking was being compared. We defined the most frequently used values and systematically grouped the slogans under these domains. Eventually, slogans of different categories were compared based on keywords, content, and the interpretation of the underlying context to merge some domains and distinguish 11 domains (see Table 1). Slogans could be categorized under more than one domain.

Reliability

To make sure that the proposed procedure was reliable, one of the researchers annotated the first 200 utterances and a second and third annotator each coded 100 of these same utterances to determine the intercoder agreement. The results of an intercoder agreement test showed that the agreement between the three

Table 1. Domains

Domain		Smoking is sóóó...	Roken is zóóó...
Big (planned) event	Events that involve a lot of people or spectators	Fainting on a festival Losing to Costa Rica	<i>Out gaan op een festival</i> <i>Verliezen van Costa Rica</i>
Eating, drinking, & stimulants	Types of food and drinks, ways of eating and drinking, buying and preparing it, alcohol and drugs	Decently drinking beer Tomato juice	<i>Netjes bier drinken</i> <i>Tomatensap</i>
Hobby/hype	Activities, things, or communities that are or were trendy or done/liked by a lot of people	Gangnam Style Making selfies	<i>Gangnam Style</i> <i>Selfies maken</i>
Technology & innovation	Old or new hardware/software and other obsolete things that are replaced by innovations	Playstation 1 Paying with guilders	<i>Playstation 1</i> <i>Met guldens betalen</i>
Person/group	Specific persons, celebrities, or groups of persons that form a program or band	Madonna Men who underestimate women	<i>Madonna</i> <i>Mannen die vrouwen onderschatten</i>
Sex/relation	Activities and situations that have to do with sexual/romantic relations and sexual inclination	Marrying your own sister Sex on the washing machine	<i>Met je eigen zus trouwen</i> <i>Seks op de wasmachine</i>
School	Things or activities that have to do with school and not going to school	Getting good grades! End of the Christmas holidays	<i>Voldoendes halen!</i> <i>Eind kerstvakantie</i>
Transport	Vehicles, ways of transport and moving	Tailgating Making a wheelie	<i>Bumperkleven</i> <i>Wheelie maken</i>
Campaign	Utterances about the campaign and the Dutch Cancer Society	Tweets about "smoking is sóóó"	<i>Tweets over "roken is zóóó"</i>
Personal features	Personal physical, external, verbal, mental features	Wearing Uggs White leggings	<i>Uggs dragen</i> <i>Witte legging</i>
Social norm	Behavior that is seen as indecent by the general norm	Throwing litter in the street	<i>Afval op straat gooien</i>

annotators for these first 200 slogans was "substantial" and even "almost perfect" (Landis & Koch, 1977, p. 165) for some categories ($\alpha = 0.61-1$). Therefore, we can conclude that the procedure for annotating the slogans was reliable. Based on these results, the additional 241 slogans were annotated.

Results

Our analysis yielded both quantitative and qualitative results. Here, we take a look at these results in consideration of the correspondence and deviation between the campaign slogans and target audience slogans on Twitter and Facebook. We

answer RQ3 by comparing the slogans of the two SNS throughout the analysis of valence, types of utterance, and domains.

Valence of the Slogans

To answer RQ1, we examined the valence of the campaign and target audience slogans on Twitter and Facebook. Table 2 shows the number of campaign slogans and target audience slogans on Twitter and Facebook with a negative or positive valence. This table shows that, overall, both campaign and target audience slogans displayed negative valence more often than positive valence. However, the target audience slogans expressed valence significantly more often on Twitter, both positive (e.g., "smoking is sóóó being friends with @someone"), and negative (e.g., "smoking is sóóó not being hired because you do not have enough experience"), compared with the overall corpus. The campaign slogans showed negative valence less frequently compared with the general distribution of conversational valence in the corpus. The valence of the slogans produced by the target audience thus mostly corresponds to the valence of the campaign slogans, but deviates on Twitter.

Type of Utterance

To answer RQ2, we analyzed whether the campaign and target audience made a comparison, an attribution, or used metonymy. As shown in Table 2, most campaign slogans and target audience slogans were comparisons. Nevertheless, on Facebook, the target audience used metonymy ("smoking is sóóó 2000 . . .") and attribution ("smoking is sóóó YUCK!") significantly more frequently and employed comparisons less frequently, both in comparison with the overall distribution of the corpus. By contrast, on Twitter, the target audience used significantly less metonymy and attribution compared with the general distribution of the corpus, while preferring the use of comparisons ("smoking is sóóó like your exes"). The target audience thus co-constructed a sentence about smoking using different types of utterances that corresponded with the campaign on Twitter but deviated from the campaign on Facebook.

Domains of the Comparisons

To further investigate how the target audience co-constructed the anti-smoking slogans, we focused on the domains smoking was compared with. Table 2 shows how the slogans from the campaign and target audience were categorized into domains. Campaign slogans and target audience slogans corresponded to a large extent when looking at the domains to which smoking was compared. The domains to which smoking was most frequently compared were "personal features," "hobby/hype," "person/group," "social norm," and "big (planned) event." When we consider the comparisons made within these domains, we see that the target audience sometimes literally copied campaign slogans or elaborated on the domains the campaign had introduced. For example, within the domain "technology & innovation," the campaign introduced comparisons with generally known old hardware and

Table 2. Distribution of valence, type, and domain of the utterances created by the campaign or target audience.

	Campaign n (%)		Target audience				Total		Statistics
			Twitter n (%)		Facebook n (%)				
Valence of slogan									
Positive	4	5.1%	20 ^b	15.0%	14	6.1%	38	8.6%	$\chi^2(2) = 10.05, p < 0.01, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.15$
Negative	26 ^a	32.9%	73 ^b	54.9%	111	48.5%	210	47.6%	$\chi^2(2) = 9.74, p < 0.01, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.15$
Type of utterance									
Metonymy and attribution	4	5.1%	2 ^a	1.5%	40 ^b	17.5%			$\chi^2(2) = 25.92, p < 0.001, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.24$
Comparison	75	94.9%	131 ^b	98.5%	189 ^a	82.5%			
Domain of the comparison									
Personal features	30	38.0%	61	45.9%	91	39.7%	182	41.3%	$\chi^2(2) = 1.45, p = 0.48$
Hobby/hype	27 ^b	34.2%	17 ^a	12.8%	41	17.9%	85	19.3%	$\chi^2(2) = 14.98, p < 0.01, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.20$
Person/group	6	7.6%	25	18.8%	31	13.5%	62	14.1%	$\chi^2(2) = 4.57, p = 0.10$
Social norm	9	11.4%	19	14.3%	26	11.4%	54	12.2%	$\chi^2(2) = 0.26, p = 0.88$
Big (planned) event	6	7.6%	15	11.3%	31	13.5%	52	11.8%	$\chi^2(2) = 3.82, p = 0.15$
Technology & innovation	15 ^b	19.0%	18	13.5%	7 ^a	3.1%	40	9.1%	$\chi^2(2) = 18.48, p < 0.001, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.22$
Sex/relation	6	7.6%	15	11.3%	16	7.0%	37	8.4%	$\chi^2(2) = 1.02, p = 0.60$
Eating, drinking, & stimulants	6	7.6%	14	10.5%	15	6.6%	35	7.9%	$\chi^2(2) = 0.81, p = 0.67$
School	1	1.3%	11	8.3%	4	1.7%	16	3.6%	Not enough cases for reliable statistical testing
Transport	6	7.6%	2	1.5%	8	3.5%	16	3.6%	Not enough cases for reliable statistical testing
Campaign	0	0.0%	7	5.3%	0	0.0%	7	1.6%	Not enough cases for reliable statistical testing

Note. The corpus included 79 campaign slogans, 133 target audience slogans from Twitter, and 229 from Facebook, which sums up to a total of 441 slogans. The superscript a means “less than expected” and b “more than expected” based on standardized residuals. Slogans could be annotated as positive, negative, or neither, and could be categorized under more than one domain. Metonymy and attribution were combined into one category for statistical testing, because separately they did not have enough cases for a statistical test to be reliably performed.

software, like “smoking is sóó floppy disk,” and the target audience responded resonantly by comparing smoking with more specific old-fashioned computer devices or programs, such as “Blackberry Ping.”

Nevertheless, Table 2 also shows significant differences with regard to the use of certain domains. The domain “hobby/hype” was significantly more frequent in the campaign slogans (“smoking is sóó line dancing”) and significantly less frequent in the target audience slogans on Twitter, compared with the general distribution of the corpus. Similarly, the domain “technology & innovation” was significantly more frequent in the campaign slogans (“smoking is sóó calling someone with your telephone”), and significantly less frequent in the target audience slogans on Facebook.

Moreover, the target audience was more provocative than the campaign. This becomes clear when examining slogans that have to do with “sex/relation” and “personal features.” For example, the target audience came up with “smoking is sóó sex on the washing machine” and “smoking is sóó big butt,” whereas the campaign introduced “smoking is sóó marrying your own sister” and “smoking is sóó dip dye” (a hair coloring style that involves dipping the ends of the hair into hair dye). So, whereas coming up with slogans from the same domain, the target audience sometimes co-constructed the slogans in a somewhat more creative or deviating manner.

A further investigation of the domains showed that a distinction can be made between comparisons with objects or behaviors that evaluate smoking as outdated and comparisons with objects or behaviors that evaluate smoking as a negative behavior. The campaign made more use than the target audience of the domains “hobby/hype” and “technology & innovation,” which are most exemplary of outdatedness. However, the target audience preferred other comparisons, comparing smoking to something uncool (“smoking is sóó dating the brother of your ex-boyfriend”), bad (“smoking is sóó losing the World Cup”), disgusting (“smoking is sóó Hawaiian pizza,” referring to a pizza with pieces of ham and pineapple), or socially immoral (“smoking is sóó playing music out loud

on the train”). With these kinds of slogans, the target audience co-constructed slogans that deviated from the original campaign message “smoking is outdated,” but nevertheless attached a negative valence to smoking.

Discussion

Our corpus-linguistic analysis of slogans from the anti-smoking campaign “Smoking is so outdated” was aimed at getting insight in the use of co-creation in health campaigns. To investigate how resonant or deviant the co-created slogans actually were, we posed three research questions concerning the valence of the slogans, the co-construction of the slogans, and the differences between slogans on different SNSs.

RQ1 concerned the conversational valence of the campaign and target audience slogans. The health campaign prompts adolescents to talk about the unhealthy smoking behavior with a negative valence. Subsequently, the target audience elicits more negative than positive valence in their slogans. In fact, the campaign is less negative compared with the overall valence in the collected corpus of slogans. A possible explanation for the fact that the target audience is more explicit in their evaluation of smoking on SNSs is that they make more use of attributions. Besides, they do not always compare smoking with something outdated, but also with something uncool, bad, disgusting, or socially immoral. Such comparisons often lead to explicit valence. On Twitter, the target audience attached not only relatively more negative but also positive valence to their slogans compared with the general distribution of the corpus.

This positive valence can occasionally be the consequence of slogans that compare smoking with something with a positive valence that is possibly meant negatively by the particular speaker: “smoking is sóó supporting Barca [soccer club FC Barcelona].” The target audience thus seems to create ironic slogans that eventually do follow the campaigns’ negative valence and compare smoking with something negative. However, since this study focuses on the content of the

slogans and we do not have information about the position of the creator of the slogan (we do not know whether he or she is a Barca fan or not), it is impossible to decide whether the slogans are actually meant ironically or not.

The goal of the “Smoking is so outdated” campaign is that the public talks about the unhealthy behavior in the first place. However, how exactly audience members talk about it is also of great importance for the campaign outcome. Unintended slogans (e.g., “smoking is sóóó delicious”) and backfiring (e.g., “smoking is sóóó the smoking is sóóó campaign”) may have serious negative consequences for the campaign.

In line with RQ2, we examined how the target audience co-constructed the “smoking is sóóó . . .” slogan by filling in the second part of the sentence, in comparison with the campaign. The campaign particularly introduced slogans that could be categorized as comparisons, whereas the target audience on Facebook introduced fewer comparisons and more attributions and metonymies compared with the general distribution of the corpus. With slogans like “smoking is sóóó disgusting” and “smoking is sóóó the ’80’s,” the target audience deviates from the campaign’s intention to compare smoking with something outdated. In these examples, we see that the target audience slogans do resonate with the campaign by using a negative valence to talk about smoking and referring to something outdated. Nevertheless, the form in which they talk about it does not correspond to the comparisons that the campaign uses to engage in a conversation about smoking. On Twitter, the opposite is true: the target audience employs fewer attributions and metonymies and more comparisons compared with the overall use of these types of utterances.

Furthermore, the analysis of the slogans pointed out to which domains the campaign and the target audience compared smoking. The first part of the slogan, presented by the campaign, gives the target audience a lot of possibilities for finishing the sentence. However, the target audience mostly followed the domains that were introduced by the campaign. In this respect, we can classify the co-construction as presupposed resonant (Du Bois, 2014). Nonetheless, the target audience also deviates from the campaign in the use of the domains “hobby/hype” and “technology & innovation.” These domains occurred more often in the campaign slogans compared with the general distribution of the corpus. An explanation for this difference can be that the target audience also deviates from the comparison of smoking with something outdated and therefore makes less use of the domains that are closely linked to this comparison. Adolescents might not understand why smoking is something outdated, because they might not see smoking in retrospect and might therefore focus on smoking as something bad or uncool in general.

Moreover, the target audience slogans were more provocative. This reflects how the campaign opts for slogans containing general accepted social norms, whereas the target audience dares to cause a stir with slogans that are more provocative and contain social norms that are not generally shared. Besides, target audience slogans seemed to include inside jokes (“smoking is sóóó falling down the stairs”), personal preferences and dislikes (“smoking is sóóó tomato juice”), and irony (“smoking is sóóó Ajax with the Cup,” referring to a Dutch soccer club based in Amsterdam winning the soccer cup). In this respect,

the campaign slogans were supposed to be understood and accepted by a broad public, whereas the target audience showed more in-group norms, with creative resonant slogans (Du Bois, 2014). This shows how the slogans are mediated by cultural context (Akaka et al., 2013). It also corresponds with the SCT (Bandura, 2004) in the sense that the target audience models the behavior of its peers, showing how learning occurs in a social context.

In some cases, deviations from the campaign message can have adverse effects on the campaign message. The first part of a co-constructed slogan usually gives meaning to the second part of the slogan. The second part can however also create a new context for the first part of the slogan (Du Bois, 2014), and the target audience can even come up with contributions that undo the intention of “smoking is sóóó . . .” This, for example, happens when the target audience turns against the campaign with slogans like “smoking is sóóó the smoking is sóóó campaign.” With such a slogan, the second part, which makes fun of the campaign, prevails, and the intention of the first part of the sentence gets lost. These slogans particularly endanger the campaign message.

In answer to RQ3 and in line with previous research (Smith et al., 2012), we conclude that the target audience engages in co-creation with an anti-smoking campaign differently on different SNS. The differences between the slogans can possibly be explained by the different co-creation routes regarding Facebook and Twitter. The Facebook slogans were created on festivals, where adolescents were photographed with their slogan on a whiteboard. The campaign posted these pictures on the Facebook page, whereas the Twitter slogans were posted directly by the target audience. It might be the case that the target audience on Twitter actually wanted to engage in the co-construction of a slogan for a broader audience, whereas the target audience on Facebook just wanted to see their picture online. Moreover, the target audience on Twitter was likely to have more time to think about the slogan they posted than the target audience on Facebook. The target audience on Facebook had to write down the slogan on the spot at the festival and had to get themselves ready for a picture. These target audience members therefore might have been less concerned with the type of slogan. On Facebook, the slogans of the target audience frequently zoomed in only on the (negative) valence and direct meaning of the slogan, using an attribution or a metonymy, while on Twitter, the slogans of the target audience were more expressive in terms of valence and more creative concerning the type of utterances. It is also possible that a comparison is more difficult to compose than a metonymy or an attribution. Moreover, the campaign team may have excluded certain expressive slogans that were created on the festivals and may have posted only a certain selection of the slogans on the Facebook page. On Twitter, the target audience could tweet any possible slogan, without any interference of the campaign team.

The campaign was targeted at adolescents, but since it was distributed through mass media and SNSs, it was open to anyone willing to contribute. However, a well-known issue with data collected from social media is that information about the users is limited, and people may even create

alternative or multiple identities for themselves online (Buchanan, 2004), making it impossible to find out who exactly created the slogans.

Moreover, certain annotation categories caused the annotators difficulties, for example, the domain “hobby/hype” ($\alpha = 0.67$). Here, the difficulty lies in the fact that it is not always clear whether a certain behavior was a hobby or a hype at some point in time. Coding the data was also complicated because some slogans contained urban language (“smoking is sóóó a chick that starts a tiff,” referring to a girl that starts a fight) or referred to specific cultural knowledge (“smoking is sóóó eating fufu with fork and knife,” referring to a dough ball—fufu—that is normally eaten by hand).

In all, this case study has enabled us to identify promising elements and challenges of a specific type of co-creation. However, in this case study, the target audience did not post their slogans directly on Facebook. It would be interesting to see whether Facebook slogans that are created by the target audience and posted on their own Facebook pages differ from our corpus of collected slogans. An important next step is also to examine the behavioral effects of co-creation campaigns. Future research should measure whether the co-construction of the slogans eventually affects the social norm of the target audience. We expect the campaign to eventually have positive effects on social norms and health behavior (Baelden et al., 2012; Christakis & Fowler, 2008), although it takes time to change a social norm (Schultz et al., 2007). Also, more research is required to investigate the motives people have to participate in the co-creation of the campaign and the reasons behind filling in the second part of the slogan in the way they do.

Conclusion

We conclude that co-creation is a promising new strategy for health campaigns, since it provides the target audience with the opportunity to show how they think about the unhealthy behavior in their own way and it enables them to further disseminate the campaign message. The co-construction of the “smoking is sóóó” slogans leads to target audience slogans that resonate and thus boost the impact of the campaign, as well as deviate from the original campaign message. Health campaigns should pay attention to the use of different SNSs and be aware that co-creation also has its dangers, making it possible for the target audience to deviate too much from the campaign slogans and thereby losing the campaign’s message. Since social norms are a determinant of smoking behavior and the Dutch “Smoking is so outdated” campaign co-creates slogans with its audience to change these social norms, the finding that the audience mostly resonates the campaign slogans makes us expect that through interpersonal communication, the campaign in the end contributes to changing smoking behavior and improving public health.

Acknowledgments

We thank Britta Brugman and Kiki Renardel de Lavalette for their help with the intercoder reliability analysis.

References

- Akaka, M. A., Schau, H. J., & Vargo, S. L. (2013). The co-creation of value-in-cultural-context. In R. W. Belk, L. Price, & L. Peñaloza (Eds.), *Consumer culture theory* (Vol. 15, pp. 265–284). Bingley, England: Emerald.
- Bacile, T. J., Ye, C., & Swilley, E. (2014). From firm-controlled to consumer-contributed: Consumer co-production of personal media marketing communication. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28, 117–133. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.001
- Baelden, D., van Audenhove, L., & Vergnani, T. (2012). Using new technologies for stimulating interpersonal communication on HIV and AIDS. *Telematics and Informatics*, 29, 166–176. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2011.05.002
- Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health, Education & Behavior*, 31, 143–164. doi:10.1177/1090198104263660
- Buchanan, E. A. (2004). *Readings in virtual research ethics: Issues and controversies*. London, England: Information Science.
- Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2008). The collective dynamics of smoking in a large social network. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 358, 2249–2258. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa0706154
- Du Bois, J. W. (2014). Towards a dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25, 359–410. doi:10.1515/cog-2014-0024
- Gebauer, J., Füller, J., & Pezzeri, R. (2013). The dark and the bright side of co-creation: Triggers of member behavior in online innovation communities. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 1516–1527. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.09.013
- Hendriks, H., de Bruijn, G., & van den Putte, B. (2012). Talking about alcohol consumption: Health campaigns, conversational valence, and binge drinking intentions. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 17, 843–853. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8287.2012.02080.x
- Hendriks, H., van den Putte, B., & de Bruijn, G. (2014). Changing the conversation: The influence of emotions on conversational valence and alcohol consumption. *Prevention Science*, 15, 684–693. doi:10.1007/s11121-013-0418-2
- Hoyer, W. D., Chandry, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M., & Singh, S. S. (2010). Consumer cocreation in new product development. *Journal of Service Research*, 13, 283–296. doi:10.1177/1094670510375604
- Jansen, B. J., Zhang, M., Sobel, K., & Chowdury, A. (2009). Twitter power: Tweets as electronic word of mouth. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60, 2169–2188. doi:10.1002/asi.21149
- Landis, J., & Koch, G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159–174. doi:10.2307/2529310
- Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30, 13–46. doi:10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18, 5–14. doi:10.1002/dir.20015
- Renes, R. J., van den Putte, B., van Breukelen, R., Loef, J., Otte, M., & Wennekers, C. (2011). *Gedragsverandering via campagnes* [Behavioral change through campaigns] (project no. EP030012). The Hague, The Netherlands: Directorate Public and Communication, Ministry of General Affairs.
- Rimal, R. N., Limaye, R. J., Roberts, P., Brown, J., & Mkandawire, G. (2013). The role of interpersonal communication in reducing structural disparities and psychosocial deficiencies. *Journal of Communication*, 63, 51–71. doi:10.1111/jcom.12000
- Ruiter, R. A., Kessels, L. T., Peters, G. J. Y., & Kok, G. (2014). Sixty years of fear appeal research: Current state of the evidence. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49, 63–70. doi:10.1002/ijop.12042
- Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2007). The constructive, destructive and reconstructive power of social norms. *Psychological Science*, 18, 429–434. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01917.x
- Seo, M., & Matsaganis, M. D. (2013). How interpersonal communication mediates the relationship of multichannel communication connections to health-enhancing and health-threatening behaviors. *Journal*

- of *Health Communication*, 18, 1002–1020. doi:10.1080/10810730.2013.768726
- Smith, A. N., Fischer, E., & Yongjian, C. (2012). How does brand-related user-generated content differ across YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26, 102–113. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2012.01.002
- Trimbos-instituut. (2014). *Factsheet continu onderzoek rookgewoonten 2013* [Fact sheet continuous research smoking habits 2013]. Retrieved from <http://www.alliantienederlandrookvrij.nl/feiten-cijfers/factsheets/>
- van den Putte, B., Yzer, M., Southwell, B. G., de Bruijn, G., & Willemsen, M. C. (2011). Interpersonal communication as an indirect pathway for the effect of antismoking media content on smoking cessation. *Journal of Health Communication*, 16, 470–485. doi:10.1080/10810730.2010.546487
- World Health Organization. (2014). *Tobacco fact sheet*. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs339/en/>
- Zwass, V. (2010). Co-creation: Toward a taxonomy and an integrated research perspective. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 15 (1), 11–48. doi:10.2753/JEC1086-4415150101