

1 Mass media campaigns and the ‘file drawer problem’: a Delphi study
2 of how to avoid campaign failure

3 James Kite¹, Margaret Thomas¹, Bill Bellew¹, Adrian Bauman¹, Anne Grunseit^{1,2}

4 1 Prevention Research Collaboration, Sydney School of Public Health and Charles Perkins Centre,

5 University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

6 2 School of Public Health, Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, NSW, Australia

7

8 Corresponding author: James Kite (james.kite@sydney.edu.au)

9 Abstract

10 Mass media campaigns are frequently used to address public health issues. Considering the
11 considerable cost, there has been surprisingly little analysis of why campaigns sometimes fail. This
12 study used a modified Delphi approach to explore the mechanisms that can lead to failure and to
13 identify what can be done to avoid or overcome common mistakes in campaign planning,
14 implementation, and evaluation. Through interviews and a survey with 28 public health social
15 marketing and mass media campaign experts, we identified four systemic factors that drive success:
16 long-term strategic thinking and commitment, understanding the campaign context, doing and
17 learning from evaluation, and fostering strong relationships. The factors did not operate in isolation,
18 rather good (or poor) execution in one area was likely to influence performance in another. The
19 experts also emphasised that a change of political context could drastically affect one or more of the
20 identified factors. Our analysis showed that campaign failures are not simply individuals making
21 mistakes. Systemic issues throughout the planning, execution, and evaluation phases need to be
22 addressed if campaign outcomes are to improve.

23 Keywords

24 Mass media campaigns, Delphi method, campaign design, campaign evaluation

25 Introduction

26 Mass media campaigns (hereafter ‘campaigns’) are a common strategy for addressing public health
27 issues. These campaigns feature a communications initiative, disseminated via mass media (which
28 includes ‘old’ media, such as television, radio, and billboards, as well as ‘new’ media, such as digital
29 banner advertising and social media), that aims to build knowledge, shift attitudes, and/or
30 encourage behaviour change.[1] They are sometimes part of broader social marketing programs
31 and/or complemented by other initiatives. Examples of these initiatives include environmental or
32 policy changes, or community-based programs; this approach has seen considerable success in areas
33 such as tobacco control and road safety.[2, 3] Despite their popularity, what constitutes ‘success’
34 and ‘failure’ in campaigns and the factors that contribute to whether they succeed or fail remain
35 elusive and open to debate.

36 While criteria for what constitutes a social marketing campaign have been proposed [4-6] and
37 guidelines on the best practices for mass media campaigns have been set out,[7-12] these fail to
38 incorporate contextual factors that influence how campaigns are designed, implemented, and
39 evaluated. Further, the discourse on campaigns in the published literature has largely centred on
40 factors that lead to success, with little attention paid to failure or what can go wrong. There may be
41 several reasons for the dearth of published studies on campaign failures. Firstly, there may be an
42 assumption that we can understand campaign failures as being the result of the lack of critical
43 success factors. However, without explicitly examining failures, we cannot be certain this is the case.
44 Secondly, evaluations are often too narrow in scope, under resourced, or, worse still, not conducted
45 at all.[13-15] Finally, there is a lack of transparency whereby evaluation findings may be kept ‘for
46 internal use only’, especially if they show little or no impact or negative impact. This is a problem
47 experienced not only in campaign evaluation but in intervention research more generally (what
48 Rosenthal [16] dubbed the ‘file drawer problem’). Consequently, there is a lack of evidence that can
49 be used to explore the circumstances under which campaigns succeed or fail and a lack of consensus
50 on what constitutes success and failure in campaigns.

51 Recently, researchers have begun to address this gap in the evidence base for social marketing
52 campaigns more broadly. Through interviews and surveys with social marketing practitioners, their
53 studies have identified factors that led to social marketing campaign failure.[15, 17, 18] These
54 include a lack of formative evaluation and research, ad hoc approaches to planning, a failure to use
55 theories and frameworks to underpin campaign design, a narrow or exclusive focus on downstream
56 factors, and failing to develop a common vision with stakeholders. One study of social marketing
57 campaigns in Aotearoa New Zealand highlighted that external influences (such as funding cuts,
58 political ideologies, and interference) can also lead to campaign failure.[19] However, this growing
59 evidence base has some limitations as the samples were skewed towards those with experience in
60 design and implementation of social marketing programs, and less commonly included participants
61 who had extensive experience in evaluation or as consultants. The perspective of these groups is
62 valuable because they play critical roles in the design, implementation, evaluation, and reporting of
63 campaigns. Further, these studies focus on the use of social marketing for any issue. Given the
64 widespread use of mass media in public health,[12, 20] a detailed analysis of this campaign context
65 would be informative for policymakers' and administrators' decision-making.

66 As in any field, it is important to share negative and null results from prevention campaigns so that
67 the community can learn from mistakes and improve practice.[16] To address the file drawer
68 problem, we sought the views of those with extensive campaign experience about what can go
69 wrong and how these mistakes could be avoided. Specifically, we asked public health social
70 marketing and mass media campaign experts:

- 71 1. What are the components and/or processes for mass media communication campaign
72 planning and implementation that are most at risk of poor execution and why?
- 73 2. Are the current measures of campaign success appropriate?
- 74 3. Can common mistakes in campaign planning, implementation, and evaluation be avoided
75 and how?

76 Our study aimed to improve understanding of the mechanisms that lead to the failure of health-
77 focussed mass communication campaigns and generate recommendations and solutions. To say, for
78 example, that lack of formative research is important and therefore campaigners should do more
79 formative research begs the question of *why* the formative research was *not* done. By taking an
80 iterative and analytical approach to examining the systemic, political, and contextual factors that
81 contribute to unsuccessful campaigns we have taken this research to a level not previously
82 examined. Our study provides new evidence about how criteria for ‘success’ may contribute to
83 campaign results being relegated to the file drawer in the first place and how, on the other hand,
84 various factors that may be difficult to change will continue to contribute to campaign failures.

85 [Methods](#)

86 The study was approved by the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (Project
87 No.: 2020/091). All participants provided written consent.

88 [Study design and recruitment](#)

89 Our study used mixed methods and sequential approach to data collection and adopted a modified
90 Delphi approach,[21] which involved three rounds of research with experts in social marketing and
91 mass media campaigns. ‘Experts’ included researchers and practitioners, including consultants, from
92 within public health who had published regularly on campaigns and/or had an extensive career in
93 planning, implementing, and/or evaluating campaigns. In this way, our study addresses the skewed
94 sample problem of earlier studies by having a broader definition of ‘expert’. Participants were
95 recruited via email between 10 March 2020 and 7 May 2020 and asked to participate in two rounds
96 of research (either Round One and Round Two or Round Two and Round Three; Fig 1). We
97 developed our initial list of experts through purposive sampling, identifying authors of campaign
98 evaluations and commentaries and drawing from our own network of international contacts. We
99 then used passive snowballing to identify additional experts; participants in Rounds One and Two
100 were asked to pass on the study details to any experts they thought would be eligible for this

101 research. We aimed to have a mix of different types of experts in Rounds One and Three to ensure
102 different perspectives on campaigns were heard at each stage of the research.

103

104 INSERT Fig 1 Study design flow chart

105

106 [Description of the sample](#)

107 We invited 38 experts to be part of the study, with 28 agreeing (12 participants completed Round
108 One and Round Two, 15 completed Round Two and Round Three, and one participated only in
109 Round Two). From the survey, most participants (n=19) had more than 15 years' experience in social
110 marketing and mass media campaigns, while the remainder had between 5- and 15-years'
111 experience. Most worked predominantly in high income settings, most commonly Australia but also
112 including the United States, the United Kingdom, Ireland and Western Europe, with only four
113 working predominantly in low- or middle-income settings, including countries in south-east Asia, the
114 Pacific Islands, and Africa. Ten participants characterised their role as being a researcher/academic,
115 11 as a 'pracademic' (someone who does both campaign design and delivery and research and
116 evaluation of campaigns), and seven as a practitioner. In the interviews, participants described their
117 roles in campaigns more specifically as including strategic planning, campaign design, appointing and
118 coordinating specialist services (e.g. creative agencies, research agencies, media planners/buyers),
119 provision of expert advice, developing and producing campaign materials, conducting formative,
120 process, and/or impact/outcome evaluation, and analysis and reporting of evaluation results.
121 Participants had worked on campaigns targeting a wide variety of health issues, including alcohol
122 consumption, road safety, tobacco and vaping control, physical activity, nutrition, immunisation, and
123 cancer screening.

124 Data collection

125 Rounds were structured sequentially so that Round One focused on identifying common points of
126 failure in campaigns, Round Two on assessing which of the points of failure were the most significant
127 in terms of their potential impact on campaign effectiveness, and Round Three on identifying ways
128 of solving or avoiding the most significant points of failure. Round One comprised semi-structured
129 interviews of approximately 30 minutes to an hour, conducted via videoconferencing with the lead
130 author. The interviews were exploratory in nature, covering the participants' experience with
131 campaign failures, their opinions on common mistakes in campaigns, the reasons for them, and how
132 they could be avoided or mitigated. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. We
133 conducted an iterative thematic analysis [22] of these interviews using NVivo 11 to identify points of
134 campaign failure. These were inductively generated from the interview material by JK, with AG and
135 MT consulted regularly throughout the process.

136 Using the points of campaign failure and subcategories of failure from Round One, we prepared a
137 structured online survey for Round Two, which was sent to all participants. The aim of Round Two
138 was to test the failures we had identified in Round One and their relationship with one another.
139 Participants were asked to consider the results of Round One, including whether they felt the results
140 reflected their experience and whether any important elements had been missed. Participants were
141 also asked to consider the significance of the failures, the frequency with which the failures
142 occurred, and whether the failures were avoidable. The survey included demographic questions on
143 campaign role(s), where we asked participants to classify themselves as a researcher/academic (i.e.
144 those with responsibility for research and/or evaluation of campaigns), 'pracademic' (i.e. those with
145 responsibility for both campaign design and delivery and research and evaluation of campaigns), [23]
146 or practitioner (i.e. those with responsibility for campaign design and delivery) and their level of
147 experience with campaigns, as measured by the number of years they had worked in the field.

148 We summarised the questionnaire results descriptively and combined them with the results from
149 Round One to a generate results summary that was shared with participants for Round Three (see
150 supplementary material). The Round Three interviews were conducted and analysed in the same
151 manner as Round One, except that these interviews explored the accuracy, relevance, and
152 usefulness of the results summary, any issues raised in the survey results, and how the identified
153 failures could be avoided.

154 Copies of the Round One and Three discussion guides and Round Two questionnaire are provided in
155 supplementary material.

156 [Mixed methods integration](#)

157 This study was a mixed methods sequential design, integrating the methods, as described above,
158 and the data at the analysis and interpretation stages.[24] As this used a modified Delphi approach,
159 we gave more weight to Round Three data.[25] Further, after initial analysis of Round Three, we
160 determined that similar themes were emerging across all rounds of the research. The strength of our
161 study is that we designed the three rounds of data collection as a cohesive investigation and report
162 the results from all rounds together, rather than separately.

163

164 [Results](#)

165 [Round One and Round Two summary](#)

166 Based on the Round One interviews, we generated three overarching categories of failure: strategic
167 failures (relating to the decisions to conduct a campaign and how it relates to other initiatives),
168 process failures (relating to campaign governance and how the campaign is managed from
169 conception through evaluation), and implementation failures (relating to the actual creative design
170 and implementation of the campaign). Each of these categories of failure had several subcategories
171 (described in Table 1). Experts generally described all failure types as having a significant impact on

172 the potential success of a campaign, but equally almost all were felt to be highly amenable to
173 change.

174 *Table 1 Description of subcategories of failure from Round 1 and Round 2*

Failure type	Description
Strategic failures	
Isolated campaigning	Campaigns are conducted in the absence of or in isolation from a larger strategy to address the health issue.
Short-termism	Campaigns are conducted over too short a time period or at insufficient intensity to have a meaningful, sustained impact on the health issue.
Political or bureaucratic interference	Campaigns are negatively influenced by political or bureaucratic pressures, such as by weakening or avoiding particular messages or removing funding.
Lack of adequate funding or resources to execute the campaign strategy	The funding and resources provided to campaign implementation are not sufficient to achieve the campaign's objectives.
Risk aversion	A tendency to avoid campaign messaging that will attract opposition, particularly from political opponents or private-sector industries, and instead adopt 'safe' campaign messaging that focuses on individual behaviour change.
Process failures	

No or poor formative research	Campaigns that lack adequate formative research to inform their design, implementation, and/or evaluation.
Weak relationships between funders, researchers, and creatives	Undervaluing the relationships that develop between funders, researchers, and creatives or impeding the development of such relationships through bureaucratic processes.
Not learning from past campaigns (own or others)	Not conducting adequate process, impact, and/or outcome evaluations of campaigns. It also extends to not reporting the results of evaluations or reporting evaluations in a way that over-emphasises campaign achievements and ignores or downplays failures or weaknesses.
Inappropriate or poor processes for the selection of creative agencies	The tendency to require creative agencies to prepare campaign ideas in a competitive pitch process. Such processes result in ill-informed or ‘safe’ campaign ideas as creative agencies work in isolation to develop their ideas and focus on what they think will get them the contract and not on what would be best for campaign outcomes.
Inappropriate or poor process for campaign approval	Slow or unresponsive processes for approval of campaigns that discourage innovation and adaptability in campaigns.
Implementation failures	
Inappropriate or poor measures of campaign success	Setting or focusing on measures of campaign success that do not (adequately) reflect the campaign objectives.
Inappropriate or poor channel selection	Selecting communication channels that are not appropriate for the campaign audience.

Inappropriate or poor campaign objectives	Setting vague, unclear, or unrealistic objectives or objectives that do not reflect the causes of the health issue being addressed.
Inappropriate or poor creative/messaging	Developing campaign messages that do not have the desired impact on the target audience and may have negative consequences such as demotivation or stigmatisation.

175

176 While the categories and subcategories of failure received broad endorsement as being appropriate
177 classifications from participants in Rounds Two and Three, Round Three participants described the
178 relationship between the failures as a more complex and nuanced process than what we had
179 represented in our results summary:

180 *For me, there's a lot more [going on] in my experience of the way it happens. [Round Three,*
181 *Participant 1, Practitioner]*

182 We therefore revised our analysis following the Round Three interviews and generated four major
183 themes from the Round One and Three interview material combined and integrated with the Round
184 Two survey results. The themes developed in this phase were more solution-focussed than the initial
185 categories and subcategories of failure. Consequently, they highlight the factors that participants felt
186 were critical for avoiding campaign failure: long-term strategic thinking and commitment;
187 understanding the campaign context; doing and learning from evaluation; and fostering strong
188 relationships (Figure 2).

189

190 INSERT Figure 2 Conceptual map of findings

191

192 Long-term strategic thinking and commitment

193 Participants talked about and strongly endorsed the need for a long-term focus on campaigning,
194 arguing that short-term approaches were at best ineffective and a waste of resources. The Round
195 Two survey results underscored this, with about half of all participants ranking isolated campaigning
196 as one of the most significant failure types in terms of its impact on campaign effectiveness and one
197 of the most frequent points of failure. However, it was also ranked as the most amenable to change
198 among the strategic failures.

199 Participants felt that adopting a long-term focus meant planning several years ahead and being
200 ready to capitalise on favourable changes in the context in which campaigns take place, especially
201 the political environment. It also meant committing campaign resources to achieve meaningful
202 change:

203 *Time, I think is vital here, you've got to be in this for the long run. [Coca-Cola have] been at*
204 *this job for 100 years trying to get this right. And they get it a little bit more right every year.*

205 *They make enormous cockups at times [but] they had an idea of their destination. I*
206 *sometimes doubt that public health has that. [Round One, Participant 3, Researcher]*

207 *In the short term, you can't change the system. But in the long term, you can. If you look at*
208 *[road safety] – which goes back to consumer-focused work in 1989, to get people to slow*
209 *down and don't drink and drive, wear your safety belts, all that sort of stuff – it's now the*
210 *[transport department that] are working with governments and car manufacturers getting*
211 *them to make safer cars and safer roads. So that's the kind of length of tenure that you need*
212 *for systemic change. And that can be problematic in a political system. [Round Three,*

213 *Participant 8, Researcher]*

214 The need to adopt a 'systems thinking' approach [26] came through strongly from some participants,
215 especially in Round Three. They emphasised the need to see health issues as a system and to
216 consider what role a campaign should play in achieving systems change:

217 *[Campaigners should] start thinking more systemically, start approaching things from a*
218 *process perspective, start joining up the dots, start working in partnerships, and get beyond*
219 *simplified decision-making and start to deal with the complexity that's there. Start to look at*
220 *the dynamics that are at work. Understand the whole system, and not just the part that you*
221 *are working in. [Round Three, Participant 4, Researcher]*

222 It was evident across all rounds that participants felt that campaigns were often treated separately
223 from broader strategies designed to address a health problem. Campaign isolation was described as
224 a key contributor to failure, and is perpetuated because as an intervention, a campaign was less
225 likely to face public and industry opposition compared with more 'intrusive' measures:

226 *Ministers do want to be seen to be doing something, [but] they want to get into a space*
227 *which is uncontroversial. "We're going to run a nice campaign over here and that means we*
228 *don't have to do anything about the [alcohol industry's] behaviour." This is enticing because*
229 *it is a quick fix. Much easier to run a campaign saying 'don't drink' than it is to set up services*
230 *to help people think about their drinking and to question global corporate capitalism, which*
231 *encourages us to solve our problems by buying stuff and consuming it, and questioning the*
232 *basic precepts of how we organize life. [Round One, Participant 3, Researcher]*

233 Understanding the campaign context

234 Participants made it clear that understanding the target audience and what objectives, channels,
235 and messaging were appropriate for them was critical for campaign success. Poor objectives were
236 felt to be particularly damaging for campaigns, with participants in Round Two ranking this as among
237 the most frequent and impactful failure types. Key points of failure for objectives were that they
238 lacked ambition, target the wrong aspects of a health problem, or are poorly constructed:

239 *I think objectives often can be too vague and not specific enough, and so then when you get*
240 *your evaluation back, you can't actually tell if you've had an impact on it. [Round One,*
241 *Participant 2, Practitioner]*

242 *Once social media and other types of digital media were introduced, it became a lot harder*
243 *to set objectives because often there was no evidence guiding where we were setting those*
244 *objectives. [Round Three, Participant 11, Researcher]*

245 Understanding the campaign context also meant knowing which messages would resonate with the
246 target audience and what channels should be used for those messages. Some interviewees spoke of
247 campaign materials that were created to gain acclaim, rather than to achieve public health
248 outcomes, and how these invariably failed to achieve those outcomes:

249 *[That] campaign didn't really fit the objective of what we're aiming to do. I think that can be*
250 *a problem and I think if people do a campaign just because they think it's a good idea or it's a*
251 *clever idea, that can be frustrating. You have to pull back and say, "This is our target*
252 *audience this is what we're trying to achieve. We're not trying to win [the creative agency]*
253 *an award." [Round Three, Participant 12, Researcher]*

254 Others highlighted the need to carefully select communication channels that were appropriate for
255 the target audience and the resources of the campaign. One participant saw the intersection of
256 channel and audience as particularly pertinent in a time when the communication landscape had
257 changed significantly:

258 *In Australia, I don't think we will ever see the big TV-led campaigns that we used to have.*
259 *People just don't watch TV like they used to. So, it is a challenge to try and achieve that reach*
260 *in the population using [new] media. And it needs to be now a combination of different*
261 *media and therefore the process that you go through of development it is going to be*
262 *different I think because your way into using the media is different. [Round One, Participant*
263 *5, Pracademic]*

264 Participants were, however, optimistic that failures to take campaign context into account were
265 avoidable, ranking all the subcategories as highly amenable to change in Round Two. They also

266 believed that these failures were strongly associated with a lack of skills and experience in the
267 campaign team, isolated campaigning, and a lack of formative research.

268 Doing and learning from evaluation

269 Evaluation was felt by many participants to be critical yet often overlooked or poorly done.

270 Participants mentioned this in relation to all levels of evaluation, from formative through to

271 outcome evaluation. The lack of or poorly conducted formative research was ranked as the most

272 significant process failure in terms of its impact on campaign effectiveness in Round Two.

273 Interviewees described it as one of the biggest contributors to campaign failure:

274 *[Being surprised by a reaction to a campaign] flies in the face of the whole notion of doing*

275 *your homework. When you put a campaign on air, it's an expensive business, you get one*

276 *opportunity to get it right, it's too late then to be ticking boxes and doing testing and having*

277 *hindsight about whether it was a good idea or not. I mean, there are campaigns that have*

278 *been pulled or which haven't worked, but I would argue that they could have been avoided if*

279 *the formative work had been done properly. [Round One, Participant 7, Pracademic]*

280 *They ended up taking [the campaign] off air because it just upset too many people. Now*

281 *when I heard that happening, I [thought] "I bet they didn't do any research or do the right*

282 *research before they put that on air." It was really obvious. They should've talked to [the*

283 *target audience]. It's a such a shame because they obviously had the money and the*

284 *resources to put a campaign on air and to have to take it off because it upset too many*

285 *people is a failure. They could have [avoided failure with better formative research]. They*

286 *should have. [Round One, Participant 5, Pracademic]*

287 Poor formative research was ranked as highly amenable to change in Round Two. Interviewees

288 believed that upskilling campaign teams and ensuring there was sufficient time and resources

289 allocated to formative research would ensure it was appropriately and thoroughly conducted,

290 thereby significantly reducing the risk of campaign failure.

291 Others pointed to the selection of appropriate measures or indicators of campaign success as an
292 important consideration. Selecting inappropriate measures of success was felt to lead to poor
293 decisions in campaign design and implementation, and was particularly a risk with digital campaigns,
294 where the number of potential indicators could be overwhelming, confusing, or lead to erroneous
295 conclusions:

296 *That's still something that we're educating stakeholders on, that just because you can*
297 *measure the clicks [or] landing pages, it doesn't mean to say it's the right thing to do, and*
298 *sometimes that can be a major distraction. [Round Three, Participant 7, Practitioner]*

299 *You know what I hate? That campaign won all sorts of awards. And it was watched by*
300 *millions of people, and it was spread all over the world. It was viral. Do you know what the*
301 *behavioural results of it [were]? Fuck all. Nothing. It [wasn't] effective. And yet so many*
302 *people hold it up there as "let's do something as good as this [because it went viral]." [Round*
303 *One, Participant 6, Practitioner]*

304 In addition to the importance of conducting rigorous evaluation, participants frequently lamented
305 that those involved in campaigns did not or could not learn from previous campaigns. In part this
306 was because of the lack of public, accessible reporting of evaluation results from campaigns, with
307 one participant suggesting that a repository for campaign evaluations may help alleviate this:

308 *If we had a resource that was available for the newbies to tap into... then we could be*
309 *learning. But it can't be embedded within the specific organizations. It has to be above that,*
310 *and to be readily available. So a sort of community of practice for government and social*
311 *marketers who want to be in mass media campaigns. [Round Three, Participant 8,*
312 *Researcher]*

313 Others spoke of barriers to learning from evaluations, including nuancing publications to hide or
314 downplay potentially politically sensitive results, as well as a lack of capacity to produce an academic
315 paper, competing priorities, and reluctance to publish null or negative results:

316 *In my time [in a government role], we did publish a little, but our capacity wasn't there to*
317 *publish and share as much as we would have liked to. Time's an issue and capacity's an issue.*
318 *[Round One, Participant 11, Practitioner]*

319 *If I had to guess, I would guess that [campaign evaluation] probably will never be published.*
320 *The incentives start to go away [over time]. You move on to other projects and you get busy*
321 *and right when the funding ends, you're not funded to work on that project anymore. So, you*
322 *really have to find the time somehow to do it. [Round Three, Participant 6, Researcher]*

323 *What I see is that all publications are about, "Hey, we have been really successful." All*
324 *papers try to find out the way to say that they'd been very successful. There's no learning*
325 *from that. [Round One, Participant 8, Researcher]*

326 **Fostering strong relationships**

327 Several interviewees described cultural and structural barriers to effective campaign practices.
328 Among these, strong relationships between all partners involved in campaign design,
329 implementation, and evaluation were seen as key to campaign success according to our
330 interviewees, although this was ranked lower in Round Two than other failure types in terms of their
331 impact on campaign effectiveness. Some interviewees felt their value was downplayed, forgotten, or
332 ignored by campaign processes, particularly those relating to procurement of specialist services such
333 as creative agencies. Consequently, participants felt that campaigns are often delivered in silos, with
334 partners from different industries or disciplines (e.g. government departments with research and/or
335 creative agencies) managed independently by the funder, rather than as a team. Campaigns were
336 felt to be most likely to succeed when all parties were able to work in partnership or as a team to
337 plan, deliver, and evaluate the campaign:

338 *There's part of me that likes the idea that it becomes a relationship between the policy*
339 *makers and implementers [with] the creative minds [and] the planners [and] the evaluation*

340 *people, so you've got them all in the room at the same time. [Round One, Participant 9,*
341 *Pracademic]*

342 One significant barrier to effective relationships described by participants was the processes for
343 selection and appointment of campaign specialists. This included creative agencies and media
344 strategists, as well as evaluators, especially those conducting formative evaluations on behalf of
345 clients. Participants felt that the governance structures for these appointments put too much
346 emphasis on probity and not enough on the value of established relationships. Selection processes
347 for creative agencies were seen as particularly problematic when the funders selected the agency
348 based only on a competitive pitch process:

349 *Giving [creative agencies] a briefing document, a 20-minute briefing on the campaign, and*
350 *then expecting them to go and work in a silo to come back with this amazing pitch idea that*
351 *they wow you with is just so unrealistic... [Round One, Participant 2, Pracademic]*

352 Such approaches, it was felt, encouraged 'safe' ideas from the creative agencies as their motivation
353 is to secure the contract. Therefore, selection of the campaign execution was being made based on
354 what was thought to be acceptable to the funding agency rather than research with the target
355 population. Similarly, the fact that these specialists are often contracted to work on a per campaign
356 basis, rather than ongoing, meant it is difficult for relationships to develop and to learn from
357 experience.

358 Some participants spoke of the need to build the skills of the campaign workforce, with mentoring
359 suggested as one avenue to facilitate improvement. Others suggested that those with campaign
360 skills and experience should seek to establish networks across public health issues (e.g. tobacco
361 control, physical activity, road safety) to share their knowledge. These participants felt currently it
362 was more common to network within a single public health issue and that consequently the pool of
363 knowledge and experiences relating to campaigns was more limited. Those with experience working

364 in low- and middle-income settings also highlighted that different settings require different
365 approaches to building the campaign workforce as the base-level of understanding varies:

366 *[In some the countries I have worked in] the idea of making a 30 second TV spot and*
367 *broadcasting it is a very unusual thing to do... Even though they're used to seeing ads for all*
368 *sorts of products on their TV, the idea of using similar marketing strategies to influence*
369 *something like health behaviours, that can be brand new. And that can be a challenge.*
370 *Whereas in somewhere like Australia, you're not gonna have to worry about that. People get*
371 *it because they're used to having seen so many campaigns in so many years, that norm has*
372 *been established. [Round Three, Participant 1, Practitioner]*

373 The way forward

374 When asked about whether campaign failure could be avoided and how the systems and processes
375 that support campaign development, implementation and evaluation could be improved,
376 participants were almost universally optimistic that change was possible. In the Round Two results,
377 for example, when asked about amenity to change the identified failures, for almost all the failure
378 types, a clear majority (above two-thirds) of participants felt they were amenable to change. Round
379 Three participants confirmed that optimism:

380 *I think you have to view [the failure types] as amenable to change. There has to be hope. If*
381 *there isn't hope, it would be a very dark day. I think the question isn't "are they amenable to*
382 *change?" I think the question is the timeframe to that change. [Round Three, Participant 4,*
383 *Researcher]*

384 While the four factors were important for understanding how to improve campaigns on their own
385 merits, they also interacted with one another. Participants described this as a symbiotic relationship,
386 with good (or poor) processes in one area felt to greatly increase the likelihood of good (or poor)
387 performance in another:

388 *It's like, if you make a process failure, it's probably also going to roll into implementation and*
389 *strategic failures, right? That they all build on each other, but you can also think you've*
390 *avoided a particular failure and then you'll be plagued with another one. [Round Three,*
391 *Participant 2, Researcher]*

392 Additionally, all four factors were influenced by the political environment of a campaign. According
393 to our interviewees, this primarily seemed to amount to interference, with participants describing it
394 as authority figures (often politicians or senior executives of government and non-government
395 agencies) exerting influence to shape a new campaign or alter or cancel an existing one. Such
396 influence was viewed as inappropriate and/or damaging to the potential effectiveness of the
397 campaign:

398 *That happens often in government as well, where going through the various levels of*
399 *approval processes, a campaign creative will get watered down, and so it just doesn't have*
400 *the same cut through or the same impact with the audience. [Round One, Participant 2,*
401 *Practitioner]*

402 *If you're a policy maker coming up with [a] campaign and you need that signed off by the*
403 *government, then you're [more likely to get an individual behaviour change campaign]*
404 *signed off. A cynic might say, "I will sign anything off that we know doesn't work." Anything*
405 *that's contentious or really hard hitting, "Well, hang on a minute." You've got some multi-*
406 *national powerful corporations who are funding governments and so on. [Round One,*
407 *Participant 1, Researcher]*

408 Yet, unlike the other factors described above, participants largely felt that such interference was
409 almost unavoidable; in Round Two, political interference was one of only two failure types were
410 most participants (68%) felt it would be difficult to change (the other was lack of funding/resources
411 at 71%). According to our participants, this reinforced the need for those involved in campaigns to
412 be ready to capitalise on disruptions in the political environment, such as a change in government.

413 However, some participants recommended separating campaign decision making from the political
414 cycle where possible. For example, one participant spoke of a government agency providing long-
415 term funding to non-government organisations to run campaigns on their behalf. While she
416 acknowledged that this model relied on the availability of suitable organisations and individuals,
417 creating this distance meant that the relatively frequent changes in the governing party or the
418 politician in charge were less likely to affect campaigns:

419 *I think there's a lot of benefits with the model that we've got, which is outsourced, in that it*
420 *helps to quarantine the money because the money is a contract and you've got to honour the*
421 *contract. And the contracts are normally five to seven years, at least. And there's an ability to*
422 *have a much stronger advocacy element and to have much harder hitting campaigns I think*
423 *than is necessarily possible these days for government delivered campaigns. [Round Three,*
424 *Participant 5, Practitioner]*

425 Most notably, though, having a culture and system that supported strong relationships between
426 campaign stakeholders, including those in the political realm, seemed to underpin success in
427 understanding the campaign context and in evaluation (Figure 2). These in turn would increase the
428 likelihood of adopting long-term strategic thinking, including being ready to capitalise on favourable
429 changes in the political environment. Bringing about change, then, requires creation of an
430 environment that supports the adoption of more appropriate campaign practices as identified by
431 our participants.

432

433 Discussion

434 Our study aimed to open the file drawer on mass media campaigns and find out what we can learn
435 from its contents. It contributes to a burgeoning literature on failures in mass media communication
436 and social marketing campaigns such as the lack of formative research and failure to plan
437 appropriately, as well as the potentially negative influence of political ideologies and

438 interference.[15, 17-19] Our findings reinforce the importance of formative research, selection of
439 appropriate measures of success, and long-term strategic and systems thinking. They also support
440 mass media communication and social marketing campaign best practice by emphasising the need
441 to understand the campaign context, including the target audience [6]. However, where we have
442 extended previous research is by showing that campaign failures are not simply due to individual
443 campaigners or campaign teams making isolated mistakes, but rather that the environment in which
444 campaigns are developed, implemented, and evaluated is often not conducive to the use of best
445 practice.

446 One key element requiring change is the structures and culture of campaign governance, something
447 that has not been highlighted in previous research. Currently, governance does not support
448 communication and relationship building, and our participants felt that these are critical in
449 maximising the chances of success. Moreover, the strength of the relationships between campaign
450 stakeholders exerts a significant influence on the likelihood of these stakeholders understanding the
451 campaign context and ‘doing and learning’ from evaluation. Working collaboratively or in
452 partnership is an important part of social marketing as a discipline, but often in the context of
453 working across sectors or agencies.[27] Our findings show it is also important to consider the value
454 of stakeholder relationships to the success of campaigns. Competitive pitch processes for selecting
455 creative agencies, for example, was one practice that our participants highlighted as needing to
456 change. While safeguards to ensure the appropriate use of funds are necessary, it appears that the
457 pendulum has swung too far towards probity concerns, with no consideration given to the harm
458 pitch processes can cause to relationships, or the risk it poses to sound definitions of campaign
459 success. We also found that governance structures tend to allow for political interference, an issue
460 that has been highlighted elsewhere.[18] Consequently, campaigns tend to be ‘safe’, targeting
461 individual behaviour change, even where there is evidence that such approaches are potentially
462 harmful.[28-30] Governance structures need to be reformed to value relationships and relationship-
463 building to foster effective and sustained collaboration and allow multi-disciplinary campaign teams

464 to develop. They also need to minimise the possibility of political interference in campaign design,
465 implementation, and evaluation.

466 Another key finding not discussed in previous studies is the importance of selecting appropriate
467 measures of success and how inappropriate measures can undermine a campaign before it has even
468 begun. This is an issue that extends beyond just evaluation to also include understanding the
469 campaign context and long-term strategic thinking. For example, evaluation indicators may be
470 appropriate to the objectives, but if the objectives are narrow and target only individual behaviour
471 change when social, environmental, or policy-related causes are more significant, then the campaign
472 may fail to achieve meaningful, population-level improvement in health-related outcomes.

473 Additionally, the increasing role of digital media in campaigns compounds this issue as so many
474 metrics are now available that it can be easy to fixate on proximal measures such as the number of
475 website hits, social media engagement (e.g., likes, comments, or shares), or other metrics that may
476 not be good indicators of more distal and significant campaign effects such as behaviour change.[31]

477 This issue highlights the interdependent relationship between the identified factors and how
478 improving one area, such as selection of appropriate campaign measures, is likely to have flow on
479 effects to address other areas, such as long-term strategic thinking. Equally, though, not addressing
480 one issue may hinder progress in another area. Those involved in campaigns should be mindful of
481 the interconnected relationship between the factors we have identified as they work to improve
482 campaign outcomes.

483 Our experts recognised the need for greater sharing of ‘warts-and-all’ campaign evaluation findings.
484 Many spoke of a lack of mechanisms to share findings, especially across public health issues (e.g.,
485 from tobacco control to road safety). The current reliance on publications in peer reviewed journals
486 was thought insufficient because of capacity constraints and a tendency to present campaigns in a
487 positive light. These flaws, along with others such as the slowness of the publication process and
488 access barriers to academic publication, are widely recognised.[32, 33] Continuing barriers to sharing
489 evaluations make it less likely that we can learn from campaign failures, but also reduce the

490 likelihood of being able to learn from successes as well. While there are opportunities to work within
491 the publishing system, such as engaging university partners to conduct evaluations and lead
492 publications, this does not resolve all the obstacles inherent in the current system. Instead, a central
493 repository, as suggested by one of our participants, could be one avenue for reducing barriers to
494 sharing campaign evaluations across health issues, like the SNAP-Ed Toolkit for obesity prevention
495 interventions (<https://snapedtoolkit.org/>). Such a repository would need to be quality-controlled
496 and managed independently of campaign stakeholders to reduce conflicts of interest and the
497 likelihood of funding being withdrawn. There would also need to be few barriers to being able to
498 share information via this repository, such as requiring peer review or paywalled access. A repository
499 of this kind may also help improve awareness of mass media communication and social marketing as
500 disciplines.[34]

501 A strength of this study is that it looked specifically at mass media communications, as opposed to
502 social marketing more broadly, which is important given the widespread use of mass media in public
503 health.[12, 20] The mixed methods Delphi approach allowed for an in-depth exploration of issues
504 and for us to test our understandings of the data from earlier rounds with the experts. Additionally,
505 our participants also represented a wider variety of experiences and roles in campaigns compared
506 with previous studies. However, our sample was skewed towards those who work in high-income
507 settings, especially Australia. It is possible that our findings may have been different had we included
508 more people with experience in low- and middle-income and non-English-speaking settings.

509 Our study has reinforced and expanded on existing research on factors that lead to campaign failure
510 by being solutions-focused and identifying how these factors could be tackled to reduce the
511 likelihood of campaign failure. What is clear is that campaign failures are not simply a matter of
512 inexperience or mistakes by campaign teams, but rather reflect systemic issues. Addressing these
513 issues requires seeing the campaign design, implementation, and evaluation process as a system,
514 rather than as discrete components. It is only by recognising how poor systems contribute to poor
515 processes that we can hope to improve mass media campaign outcomes.

516

517 Acknowledgements

518 We wish to thank all the participants for their time in completing this study.

519 References

- 520 1. Willoughby, J.F. and S.M. Noar, *Fifteen Years after a 10-year Retrospective: The State of*
521 *Health Mass Mediated Campaigns*. Journal of Health Communication, 2022. **27**(6): p. 362-
522 374.
- 523 2. Durkin, S., E. Brennan, and M. Wakefield, *Mass media campaigns to promote smoking*
524 *cessation among adults: an integrative review*. Tobacco control, 2012. **21**(2): p. 127-138.
- 525 3. Elder, R.W., R.A. Shults, D.A. Sleet, et al., *Effectiveness of mass media campaigns for*
526 *reducing drinking and driving and alcohol-involved crashes: A systematic review*. American
527 Journal of Preventive Medicine, 2004. **27**(1): p. 57-65.
- 528 4. Wettstein, D. and L.S. Suggs, *Is it social marketing? The benchmarks meet the social*
529 *marketing indicator*. Journal of Social Marketing, 2016. **6**(1): p. 2-17.
- 530 5. French, J. and C. Blair-Stevens, *Big pocket guide to social marketing*. London: National Social
531 Marketing Centre, 2007: p. 138.
- 532 6. French, J. and R. Russell-Bennett, *A hierarchical model of social marketing*. Journal of Social
533 Marketing, 2015. **5**(2): p. 139-159.
- 534 7. Bauman, A., *Precepts and principles of mass media campaign evaluation in Australia*. Health
535 Promotion Journal of Australia, 2000. **10**(2): p. 89.
- 536 8. Grunseit, A., B. Bellew, E. Goldbaum, et al., *Mass media campaigns addressing physical*
537 *activity, nutrition and obesity in Australia: An updated narrative review*, 2016, The Australian
538 Prevention Partnership Centre: Sydney, Australia.
- 539 9. Noar, S.M., *A 10-Year Retrospective of Research in Health Mass Media Campaigns: Where*
540 *Do We Go From Here?* Journal of Health Communication, 2006. **11**(1): p. 21-42.
- 541 10. Randolph, W. and K. Viswanath, *Lessons learned from public health mass media campaigns:*
542 *marketing health in a crowded media world*. Annu Rev Public Health, 2004. **25**: p. 419-37.
- 543 11. World Health Organization, *Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. Report*
544 *of a WHO consultation*, 2000, World Health Organization: Geneva.
- 545 12. Wakefield, M.A., B. Loken, and R.C. Hornik, *Use of mass media campaigns to change health*
546 *behaviour*. The Lancet, 2010. **376**(9748): p. 1261-1271.
- 547 13. Leavy, J.E., F.C. Bull, M. Rosenberg, et al., *Physical activity mass media campaigns and their*
548 *evaluation: a systematic review of the literature 2003-2010*. Health Educ Res, 2011. **26**(6): p.
549 1060-85.
- 550 14. Noar, S.M., *Challenges in Evaluating Health Communication Campaigns: Defining the Issues*.
551 Communication Methods and Measures, 2009. **3**(1-2): p. 1-11.
- 552 15. Cook, J., S. Fries, and J. Lynes, *Checking Our Blind Spots: The Most Common Mistakes Made*
553 *by Social Marketers*. Social Marketing Quarterly, 2020. **26**(1): p. 14-27.
- 554 16. Rosenthal, R., *The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results*. Psychological bulletin,
555 1979. **86**(3): p. 638.
- 556 17. Akbar, M.B., L. Foote, C. Soraghan, et al., *What Causes Social Marketing Programs to Fail? A*
557 *Qualitative Study*. Social Marketing Quarterly, 2021. **27**(2): p. 99-116.
- 558 18. Cook, J., J. Lynes, and S. Fries, *Exploring Mistakes and Failures in Social Marketing: The Inside*
559 *Story*. Social Marketing Quarterly, 2021. **27**(1): p. 13-31.

- 560 19. Antric, T., M. Toledano, and D. McKie, *Learning From Practice and Politics: The Rise and Fall*
561 *of Social Marketing in Aotearoa New Zealand (1984–2017)*. Social Marketing Quarterly,
562 2021. **27**(1): p. 32-47.
- 563 20. Chau, J.Y., B. McGill, M.M. Thomas, et al., *Is this health campaign really social marketing? A*
564 *checklist to help you decide*. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 2018. **29**(1): p. 79-83.
- 565 21. Adler, M. and E. Ziglio, *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social*
566 *policy and public health*1996: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- 567 22. Braun, V. and V. Clarke, *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. Qualitative research in
568 psychology, 2006. **3**(2): p. 77-101.
- 569 23. Powell, E., G. Winfield, A.M. Schatteman, et al., *Collaboration between practitioners and*
570 *academics: Defining the pracademic experience*. The Journal of Nonprofit Education and
571 Leadership, 2018. **8**(1).
- 572 24. Doyle, L., A.-M. Brady, and G. Byrne, *An overview of mixed methods research—revisited*.
573 Journal of research in nursing, 2016. **21**(8): p. 623-635.
- 574 25. Leech, N.L. and A.J. Onwuegbuzie, *A typology of mixed methods research designs*. Quality &
575 quantity, 2009. **43**(2): p. 265-275.
- 576 26. Arnold, R.D. and J.P. Wade, *A Definition of Systems Thinking: A Systems Approach*. Procedia
577 Computer Science, 2015. **44**: p. 669-678.
- 578 27. Duane, S. and C. Domegan, *Social marketing partnerships: Evolution, scope and substance*.
579 Marketing Theory, 2019. **19**(2): p. 169-193.
- 580 28. Zharekhina, L. and K. Kubacki, *What messages does social marketing advertising send? A*
581 *content analysis of advertisements aiming to minimise harm from alcohol consumption*.
582 International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 2015. **20**(4): p. 285-298.
- 583 29. Kite, J., A. Grunseit, E. Bohn-Goldbaum, et al., *A Systematic Search and Review of Adult-*
584 *Targeted Overweight and Obesity Prevention Mass Media Campaigns and Their Evaluation:*
585 *2000–2017*. Journal of Health Communication, 2018. **23**(2): p. 207-232.
- 586 30. Gordon, R., R. Russell-Bennett, and R.C. Lefebvre, *Social marketing: the state of play and*
587 *brokering the way forward*. Journal of Marketing Management, 2016. **32**(11-12): p. 1059-
588 1082.
- 589 31. Niederdeppe, J., *Meeting the Challenge of Measuring Communication Exposure in the Digital*
590 *Age*. Communication Methods and Measures, 2016. **10**(2-3): p. 170-172.
- 591 32. Barbour, V., *The future of academic publishing: disruption, opportunity and a new*
592 *ecosystem*. Medical Journal of Australia, 2019. **211**(4): p. 151-152. e1.
- 593 33. The Guardian *The Guardian view on academic publishing: disastrous capitalism*. The
594 Guardian,, 2019.
- 595 34. Akbar, M.B., L. Foote, A. Lawson, et al., *The social marketing paradox: challenges and*
596 *opportunities for the discipline*. International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing,
597 2021.

598

Figures




Fig 2 Study design flow chart




Fig 3 Conceptual map of findings




Fig 1




Fig 2