

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONCEPTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL MARKETING

Serpil Ünal KESTANE<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The subject of this study is the similarities and differences between the concept of social marketing focusing on societal problems and corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations concepts. The goal is to remove incomprehensibility regarding these concepts in definitions and practices that are included in existing literature. The study is a result of a review of both Turkish and foreign literature. As a finding of the study, it was revealed that there are similarities between social marketing and corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations practices but there are also notable differences among these four basic concepts. It was noticed in the literature review and practices that the concepts of social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations were sometimes used instead of one another while the concept of social marketing was examined. This study will be helpful in distinguishing and using the concepts for people who deal with the subject by stating the differences among these concepts more clearly.

**Keywords** – Social marketing, corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing, public relations.

**JEL Classification:** M3

## SOSYAL PAZARLAMA İLE İLİŞKİLİ KAVRAMLAR ARASINDAKİ FARKLILIKLAR

### ÖZ

Bu çalışma, toplumsal sorunları konu edinen sosyal pazarlama kavramı ile kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, amaca yönelik pazarlama ve halkla ilişkiler kavramları arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları konu edinmektedir. Amaç, literatürde yer alan tanım ve uygulamalarda bu kavramlarla ilgili kafa karışıklığının az da olsa giderilmesidir. Çalışma, yerli ve yabancı kaynak taraması ile ortaya çıkmıştır. Yapılan literatür taramalarında ve uygulamalarda sosyal pazarlama kavramı ele alınırken bazen kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, bazen amaca yönelik pazarlama ve bazen de halkla ilişkiler kavramlarının birbirlerinin yerine kullanıldığı görülmüştür. Bu çalışma, bahsedilen kavramlar arasındaki farklılıkları daha açık bir şekilde ortaya koyarak konuyla ilgilenen kişilere kavramları ayırt etmek ve kullanmak konusunda bir kolaylık sağlayacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Sosyal pazarlama, kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, amaca yönelik pazarlama, halkla ilişkiler.

**JEL Sınıflaması:** M3

---

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Prof., Dokuz Eylül University İzmir Vocational School, serpil.caliskan@deu.edu.tr

## 1. Introduction

Today, rapid changes and developments in the fields of technology, communication and information are significant not only in terms of increasing profits and income in the world but also in increasing sensitivity towards social issues. The whole world seems to be more aware of the social issues as environmental pollution, safe sex, prevention of contagious diseases, obesity, planned parenthood, educating girls and poverty; and have started to fight against these and similar issues.

While, previously, social issues concerned mostly public corporations and nonprofit organizations; now they have become important for businesses and all other individuals, entities and organizations. Social projects and campaigns have been conducted for the purpose of drawing attention to and solving such social issues. Right at this point, concepts such as social marketing, corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations have become essential.

While serving common purposes, they are in fact different concepts, which cause incomprehensibility in literature. The goal in this study is to clarify the incomprehensibility particularly between the concept of social marketing and other concepts.

## 2. The Concept of Social Marketing

The concept of social marketing emerged as a discipline in the 1970s with the studies of Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman regarding marketing. The roots of the understanding of social marketing date back to the studies of scientists in the 1940s and 1950s, such as Wiebe, Meendelsohn, Lazrsfeld, Metron, Hyman and Sheatley, focusing on social psychology, personal communication, advertising and public relations (Bayraktaroğlu and İltter, 2007). As a socialist, Wiebe is among the first people to state in an article he wrote in the 1950s that marketing practices could also be successful in fields other than commercial firms' marketing their goods and services. Harwey claims that practices geared towards family planning in 1964 in India are the first social marketing studies. Yet, until the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, this topic did not create much interest at all. With the onset of the Vietnam War and social restlessness, many sectors in US society started to consider their social responsibilities (Andreasen, 2006). Thus, ideas put forth by Wiebe and other scientists have again come into play. In 1971, Kotler considered marketing as a technology and together with Zaltman, he stated that this technology could be applied in social issues as well, calling this social marketing.

Kotler and Zaltman define social marketing as the design, implementation and control of some marketing practices such as product planning, pricing, communication, distribution and marketing research and programs that might affect the acceptability of social ideas and thoughts (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971).

Therefore, social marketing encompasses the design and implementation of marketing programs for family planning, safe-driving, and anti-smoking. It is the application of standard marketing management concepts and tools to the problem of the dissemination of social ideas and social products. It should be noted, however, that this definition of social marketing as the marketing of social ideas is a product typology-based definition. If one uses a marketer or organization typology based definition, social marketing may be broadened to include marketing undertaken by non-profit, non business organizations (El Ansary, 1974).

These periods led to confusion over two issues which were then discussed in academic terms over the following 20 years; one of which was the confusion among the concepts of nonprofit marketing, social marketing and social responsibility. Secondly, the definition offered by Kotler and Zaltman created confusion between the concepts of social advertising and public relations. Further, this definition makes it harder to distinguish social marketing from social responsibility marketing. This confusion is more apparent in the book titled social marketing published in 1973 by Lazer and Kelley (Andreasen, 2006):

“Social marketing is related with the practices of marketing knowledge, concepts and techniques that may increase economic as well as social consequences. This is also related with the analysis of social consequences of marketing policies, decisions and activities.” As seen in this definition, the concepts of social marketing and social responsibility mingle.

In a book written by Kotler, Roberto and Lee in the year 2002, social marketing is defined as the use of marketing principles and techniques that will affect target population in order to accept reject or give up a behavior for the benefit of individuals, groups or society as a whole.

Most often social marketing is applied for the purpose of affecting the population in order to change attitudes to improve health, prevent damage, protect the environment, or support society. What is meant by behavior here is (Kotler et.al., 2002):

- Accepting a new attitude,
- Rejecting a potential behavior,
- Correcting a present behavior or
- Leaving an old behavior.

Moreover, Kotler et al. defines social marketing practitioners as experts working for public entities and organizations, experts working for nonprofit organizations and experts working for profit oriented organizations. Thus, it is emphasized that social marketing concerns not only public but also nonprofit and profit organizations.

Social marketing was defined by Kotler and Lee in 2010 as a process using marketing principles and methods in order to create a value, understand and deliver it for the purpose of affecting the behaviors of the target population in a way that will benefit both that target population and society in general (public health, environment and communities) (Kotler and Lee, 2010). In essence, social marketing is the adaptation, rather than direct transference, of marketing tools and techniques for social change campaigns (Dann, 2005).

As seen, the first of social marketing definitions by Kotler (1971) dwelled on the convenience of using marketing devices on social issues, while the definition in 2002 emphasized voluntary behavioral change and the definition in 2010 stressed creating a behavioral change through social marketing in order to gain value for society.

When all these definitions are summed up, it can be stated that social marketing aims at creating a behavioral change in favor of the society. Traditional marketing devices are used in creating this behavioral change. However, due to the substantial differences in the environments within which form the focus on campaigns, it has never been possible to import commercial marketing practice wholesale into the social marketing environment (Dann, 2005).

As it can be understood from the definitions, social marketing activities seem to be under the responsibility of the state. However, recently, nonprofit organizations as well as private businesses do some social marketing activities. The case that particularly the profit oriented private businesses has a rising emphasis on the issue and participating in more social marketing activities causes a conflict between the social marketing and other related concepts (concepts such as corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing, social advertising and public relations). Below are the differences among the concepts related with social marketing.

### **3. Social Marketing and Corporate Social Responsibility**

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a concept that cannot be explained easily either theoretically or empirically. Theoretically, Carroll (1999) examined and discussed that there are more than 25 different ways to define CSR in academic terms. Various scholars, practitioners of CSR, groups and organizations such as the World Trade Council and United Nations have made their own definitions with regards to the issue (Godfrey et.al., 2010).

To illustrate, in the European Commission 2001 CSR strategy, corporate social responsibility is defined as a concept that proposes that businesses voluntarily integrate their social and environmental priorities into business processes and relationships with their partners (EU, 2002). In the CSR strategy announced in 2011, the concept of CSR was simplified even more and defined as “businesses’ taking responsibility regarding social effects” (EU, 2011).

The United Nations Commerce and Development Conference (UNCTAD) discusses corporate responsibility from the perspective of to what extent businesses are interested in the needs and goals of a society.

The strategic consultancy group of the International Standardization Organization (ISO) discusses corporate social responsibility as an approach in which organizations indicate economic, social and environmental problems in a way that benefits the public and society as a whole (Aktan, 2007).

When the definitions of academicians and researchers in the field are examined, Mohr, Web and Harris define corporate social responsibility as the “company’s commitment, which will minimize or remove any harmful effect on society and maximize long term benefits”, which includes both multi dimensional definitions and social marketing based definitions. The multi-dimensional definition describes basic responsibilities of a firm while social marketing based definition can be used to define CSR in a very brief way (Mohr et al., 2001) .

Karna et. al. define CSR as businesses’ contribution to sustainable economic development, and its commitment to increasing the quality of life of employees, their families and society as a whole (Kelgökmen, 2010).

The corporate social responsibility definition of Carroll covers the economical, legal, ethical and other voluntary expectations of a society regarding the organization at a given period of time (Bakker et.al., 2005) . Carroll (1991) named these expectations with the CSR pyramid and ranked the responsibilities as economical ones being at the bottom, meaning that the business is profitable in the goods and services it produces, acting in line with the laws on the second layer, being ethical in the activities it conducts. On the top layer, he listed the responsibilities of fulfilling expectations in regards to being a good citizen. CSR directly covers the two responsibilities at the top and indirectly the whole pyramid because CSR is businesses’ voluntary contribution for a better society and a better environment (Argüden, 2007).

According to Yunus and Weber (2010), CSR means the charity fund that is formed generally by a profit making organization in order to make activities for the benefit of society. For instance, the CSR unit of a firm may donate a sum of money to a school or a hospital, award scholarships for poor children or support a cleaning day at a local park or a beach. CSR programs are mostly used to form a firm’s ‘good neighbor’ or ‘good citizen’ image. A firm practicing CSR devotes 95% of its sources for profit making and 5 % (or less) for making the world a better place. However, some studies point out that CSR is not only a type of charitableness but a consistent policy supporting long term goals (Kelgökmen, 2010). Since the last decade, companies are under mounting pressure to take responsibility for the effects of their corporate conduct on society, especially when these effects go beyond the firms’ direct commercial interests. As a result, an increasing number of companies, big and small alike, have developed CSR programs (Corbishley, 2007).

Although all of these definitions and studies with regards to the issue may sometimes cause confusion, the importance of CSR in management and practices is increasing, and several agencies around the world have started focusing on issues that measure and improve the social investments and performances of commercial organization in the world (Godfrey et.al., 2010).

The universities, agencies, organizations and the 4CR organization established by individuals who work on the issues of strategic corporate social responsibility and sustainability, classify the fields of CSR under three headings as workplace, market and environment and society. Issues such as health and safety in the workplace, equal opportunities, payment policies etc. are under the workplace heading; product safety, ethical standards, individual information security etc. are listed under the market heading and environmental risk management, environmental performance, human rights, animal rights, social support etc. are listed under the environment and society heading. Based on this classification, corporate social responsibility starts within the firm and ends in the environment and society (Bali and Cinel, 2011).

Briefly, corporate social responsibility is related to general management and integrates with the firm activities thanks to the values, culture, strategies and reporting mechanisms of the firm.

As can be deduced from all of these explanations, the concept of social marketing and corporate social responsibility are different than each other, but they are concepts that benefit from one another in practice and their definitions overlap. For example, the definition of social marketing made by Kotler and Zaltman in 1971 caused rapid growth of the definition of corporate social responsibility and the emergence of alternative theories. Rather than explaining the social responsibilities of a firm as a whole, this definition deals with the focus on issues regarding social responsibility in the marketing mix (Grigore, 2011).

As a result, while social marketing activities are seen as being more the responsibility of the government, profit making businesses come into prominence in CSR. The profit making businesses act responsibly towards all of their partners through CSR activities. This type of behavior gains the benefit of creating brand value and market value, attracting more qualified staff, motivating and keeping them, entering new markets, increasing customer loyalty, and increasing share value. CSR assists an organization in building loyalty amongst its stakeholders, which includes shareholders, the government and other institutions. It helps businesses to enter new markets, to generate publicity and to store up goodwill which can be beneficial at crucial moments (Corbishley, 2007). However, the first goal in social marketing is to create behavioral change to create value in society rather than commercial gains. Creating corporate image and increasing sales are secondary aims. Moreover, social marketing activities are more temporary and inconsistent in profit making organizations while as previously mentioned above, CSR is a concept that is consistent

and that forms integrity through all of an organization's strategies and policies, values, culture, decision making and reporting mechanisms.

However, both concepts have common points: they both mainly serve to create a better society and a better environment. Profit-making businesses use social marketing as a tool while performing CSR.

#### **4. Social Marketing and Cause-Related Marketing**

Cause-related marketing (CRM) has also been defined as "citizen marketing" and "public purpose marketing"; however, the term CRM has been accepted more in literature (Swensson and Wood, 2011).

Varadarajan and Menon (1988) defined CRM as the process of adjusting and performing the marketing activities offered by the firm based on donating some amount of money of which the determined purpose depends on customers' taking place in income attributing changes that may realize individual and organizational goals.

According to Rtacek and Salavar (1997) CRM is to increase company sales and commercial image by helping a nonprofit subject (Swensson and Wood, 2011). Carol L. defines cause-related marketing as a firm's marketing efforts to associate its products with a social problem. Thus, the aim of cause-related marketing is both creating trust towards the business, deepening customer relations and improving sales and the corporate image while helping to solve a social problem. In this regard, cause-related marketing is seen as a way of creating a brand image, gaining loyal customers and as a result increasing sales (Gifford, 1999).

Using the definitions in literature, Odabaşı and Oyman (2005) listed the distinctive features of cause-related marketing as follows:

- Firms' integrating with a social problem, an issue or a purpose; and cooperation with another nonprofit organization for this purpose,
- Introducing goods and services to consumers for income generating changes and consumers' becoming a part of the activity as well,
- Donating a part (sometimes all) of the income obtained to the party in cooperation regarding the social purpose,
- The firm announcing the support it has given to the social purpose in its marketing messages.

In cause-related marketing, an organization takes the responsibility of donating a percentage of income based on product sales for or contributing to a special social purpose. The organization generally works in partnership with a nonprofit organization. Hence, while helping a charity, it also increases the sales of a product and thus both parties have mutual benefit (Özdemir, 2009).

CRM can be regarded as showing businesses' sophisticated investments and corporate charitableness openly. It is a marketing program that serves two main purposes: increasing the firm's commercial performance by creating a fund to serve a purpose through selling the firm's goods and services and helping for a significant purpose. CRM can be considered synonymous with promotional activities that are beneficial for the public, for charity, and for sponsorship activities for charity purposes. In fact, while CRM is a different concept than these, it is often a mixture of them (Varadarajan and Menon, 1988). Or CRM can be seen as a link between the firm's corporate charity activities and sales promotional activities (Cheron et al., 2012).

Regarding the process of cause-related marketing activities, the firm needs to determine a field and find a significant purpose. Cooperation can be made with a nonprofit organization in realizing the purpose regarding the issue or the firm may choose to walk alone. While doing these, it announces the CRM performance through conventional marketing practices, because the final purpose in cause-related marketing is to create the firm image and increase sales. After realizing CRM practices, it follows up the results and shares it with the public.

CRM emphasizes the transaction. The consumer's behavior comes first and as a result of that behavior a donation is made to the cause that has been identified by company. The link with product sales or transactions is therefore the distinguishing element of CRM, and contains a mutually beneficial understanding that the project will raise funds for charity, and benefit the corporation by increasing sales (Corbishley, 2007).

The basis of both cause-related marketing and social marketing is to examine a problem related with society and work on the points of solution regarding that problem. In this respect, both concepts contribute to the firm obtaining a positive image and improving it. However, cause-related marketing efforts are mostly for organizations in the private sector while public organizations are generally the leader and performer in social marketing studies. Also, cause-related marketing covers the use and sale of goods and services of the firm while social marketing does not cover this. Yet, these two concepts can still overlap because private businesses may use cause-related marketing activities while contributing to social marketing activities.

### **5. Social Marketing and Public Relations**

Despite having numerous definitions, public relations is one of the concepts that are hard to define. Rex Harlow examined 83 definitions from public relations experts and 472 other definitions that he found in books, magazines and newspapers (Yengin, 2000). IPRA (International Public Relations Association) specifies Harlow's definition which includes all of these public relations definitions as "a good definition". According to this definition, public relations is "a unique management function that helps manage and sustain a mutual understanding, acceptance, cooperation and communication between the organization and target population; that as-



sists management by regularly informing it about the public with regards to managing problems and issues, helping it become sensitive; that defines and stresses out the management responsibility to act for the sake of public; that helps management adapt change and benefit from it by acting as an early warning system in order to help detect tendencies in advance; and finally, that makes use of research methods and communication techniques that are healthy and appropriate to ethical principles as primary tools” (Pira, 2012). This definition includes the premises of several other definitions made in the field of public relations.

However, the four models of Grunig (Thornhill, 2012), who is known as the father of the modern theory of public relations, which left its mark in the last century, is significant in terms of our subject. In terms of the historical development process and the type of communication, these models are listed as follows:

- Press agency/introduction model
- Public informing model
- Dual asymmetrical model
- Dual symmetrical model.

The first two of these models develop studies towards press while the last two call for several different groups as they hold more professional practices. In particular, the dual symmetrical model represents the last stage in public relations. In this model where creating an activity as part of public relations becomes prominent, research and giving feedback bring more efficient outcomes. Social responsibility projects are areas where the dual asymmetrical model is most intensely used. The changes in social life in the 1960s led to the emergence of this model. While organizations tried to make themselves adaptable to the public, the dual symmetrical model was shaped (wordpress.com, 2010).

It is difficult to have a common definition for the term public relations. Further, it overlaps with many concepts since it has a wide field of practice, it cooperates with different fields of the social sciences; it can be performed in organizations with various purposes by making use of the different techniques of these fields and it needs to be applied in almost all fields where there are human relations (Kocabaş et.al., 1999). The dual symmetrical model of public relations in particular coincides with social marketing practices. Both disciplines use behavioral, psychology, social sciences, and marketing and communication theories.

For example, Alan Andresan’s Social Change Marketing in 1995 tells about “the role social marketing plays in the agenda making process”. Agenda making is the primary function of public relations, which has become integrated with Bernard C. Cohen’s statement “media doesn’t tell us about what we think but what we think about” for almost a century. According to McKie and Tolando’s interpretation; thus

agenda making theory has become a part of the list of theories suggested by social marketing people in social marketing practices (Thornelyhill, 2012).

When literature and textbooks on public relations and social marketing are examined, it is seen that there is lack of information about public relations and incomprehensibility regarding social marketing. Public relations most often regard social marketing as a discipline which serves public relations and that is related with communication campaigns; further, it mentions social marketing either very marginally or not at all. For instance, social marketing is not mentioned in public relations encyclopedia. Also, in Health's "Public Relations Handbook", the term social marketing does not appear in the index. It is also seen that the term does not appear in the latest editions of many textbooks about public relations (for example; Effective Public Relations by Cutlip, Centre and Bloom, 2006). Social marketing was mentioned only on two of the 387 pages in the Public Relations book by Lattimore, Baskin, Heiman and Toht published in 2007. Here, social marketing is defined as a special form of public relations that tries to change the habits and behaviors of society regarding a social event rather than a sponsorship organization (Mckie and Toledano, 2008).

Actually, it may not be totally right to compare public relations and social marketing practices because while public relations is a discipline that has existed since the first half of the twentieth century, social marketing emerged in the second half of the twentieth century. Naturally, public relations have a much stronger and more professional background. However, the differences between the two concepts can generally be summarized as follows (Mckie and Toledano, 2008: Tengilimoğlu and Öztürk, 2008):

- The organizational goal in public relations is image developing and forming good relationships with society and employers, while social marketing aims to create change in behavior in favor of society and individuals.
- While the aim of public relations is to adopt new products and ideas; the aim of social marketing is accepting a new behavior, rejecting a potential behavior or ensuring that an old behavior is abandoned.
- Public relations activities are less concerned with creating behavioral change in society and measuring the gain from a campaign by assessing this change. On the other hand, this is the main goal of social marketing.
- When the practices of social marketing throughout its short history are examined, it can be seen that there are approaches that are less to do with the discipline but that can change the world more.
- While there is a very close relationship with the staff in public relations in particular, social marketing is mainly related to the target population outside the organization.

- Public relations deals with the others outside the environment of the organization while social marketing generally focuses on the target population with which it tries to create behavioral change.

## 6. Conclusion

In all stages of life, while human beings deal with their own problems and needs and their own interests, they cannot be ignorant about others' problems and needs. Social problems have been dealt with either through individual efforts or by means of entities and organizations that appear in society, such as temples, schools and health centers. Today, the field of groups have grown even more and entities and organizations, profit or nonprofit, have felt the need to deal with social problems and review their own responsibilities. These feelings and opinions are reflected in the activities of the organizations and new concepts and theories on the issue have emerged in academic literature. Social marketing can be examined as one of the new concepts that might find a solution for the social problems.

This concept, which was first introduced to marketing literature by Kotler and Zaltman in the 1970s is related to creating a positive change in societal attitudes on issues such as planned parenthood, environmental pollution, poverty etc., the environment, health and education. While realizing this effort, social marketing makes use of traditional marketing devices. However, like social marketing, social issues are dealt with and solutions are sought in corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations activities. Most of the time, the tools used and goals of these three concepts can be similar to those of social marketing. Therefore, there may be incomprehensibility. However, there is a difference in their final goals and practices while fulfilling their activities for the sake of society.

For example, the implementer of these four concepts are different from each other. The implementers of social marketing are generally governments or non-profit organizations. However, corporate social responsibility activities are usually carried out by profit-making companies. Yet, it is observed that the implementers of cause-related marketing activities are profit-making companies, while public relations activities is an activity or business action carried out by both profit-making companies and non-profit organizations.

There is a difference among these four concepts in continuity of activities. As mentioned above, social marketing is generally carried out by non-profit organizations such as governments or non-governmental organizations. The purpose of the activity is to create a change in the attitude of the public about a social problem. Naturally, the matters which are dealt with need long time to solve in the society, such as family planning, healthy eating, environment, problems of women and sexuality. However, there will be no need for social marketing activities either when the attitude change desired by social marketing takes place or when the problem isn't considered as a problem anymore. For example, the social marketing activities car-

ried out by organizations struggling against tuberculosis have been decreasing, for the tuberculosis disease is almost none existing today. For this reason, it will not be wrong to say that social marketing activities are temporary activities. Again, cause-related marketing is about the problems that the organizations deal with as well. In such cases, the purpose of the organization is not to solve the problem but provide help in solving the problem. For this reason, it is possible to say that cause-related marketing activities are temporary activities as well. However, corporate social responsibility and public relations activities are continuous activities, for they are directly related to the principles, main goals and purposes of the corporation.

There are similarities and differences of the primary and ultimate goals of above-mentioned activities. For example the primary goal of the social marketing is “to create an attitude change, to make the community to abandon an existing attitude or to create a new attitude” about a social problem that is dealt with. The ultimate goal is to create benefit for the individuals, groups and the society as a whole. Corporate social responsibility primarily tries to create benefit for the associates both in and out of the organization. However, it aims to create brand value, enter new markets, keep qualified personnel or gain new ones and, of course, increase selling and profits. Cause –related marketing has primary goal to create benefit for the targeted group and to contribute in the resolution of a social problem. At the end, as corporate social responsibility, it aims to create brand image, increase relations with customers, create loyal customers and, of course, increase sellings and profits. Primary goal of public relations is to create a positive image in the community, while the ultimate goal is similar to that of corporate social responsibility and cause-related marketing.

Another difference between social marketing and the above-mentioned concepts is about the use of the goods and services of the corporation. For example, in carrying out cause-related marketing activities, goods or services of the corporation are generally used. . It is a general to try to contribute in solving of the problem by trying to increase the selling of the goods and services of the corporation. The use of the goods and services of the corporation in the sponsorships is the case in public relations activities. However, the products of the company may not be used in public relations activities such as creating image, familiarity, introduction, lobbying. For that reason, it can be said that the products of the company are sometimes used in public relations activities. However, this situation is rarely seen in social marketing and corporate social responsibility.

Additionally, it is possible to measure the efficiency of the above-mentioned concepts, although it is difficult. Different criteria are used in measuring the efficiency of these activities. For example, the effect of the carried activities to image of the brand, selling and profit is used as a criteria in corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations activities, whereas the achieved attitude change in the long term is the criteria for social marketing.

When the differences and similarities among these concepts are considered in terms of target audience, the target audience in social marketing is the focused group about the social problem. Target audience is associates both in and out of the organization for corporate social responsibility; all associates out of the organization as from the focused social group about the problem(because cause-related marketing is not related to the associates from the organization) for cause-related marketing; all groups in and out of the organization as from staff to customers and all community for public relations.

When funding of the activities is considered, groups contributing funds for social marketing are their donator and taxes. However, the investors fund their own activities for corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations.

As can be seen, four concepts discussed above essentially have the goal to serve the community. However, when considered generally, it can be said that concepts, except social marketing, actually serve a win-win strategy. The final goal of corporate social responsibility, cause-related marketing and public relations is to create customer loyalty and change this into profit by creating a positive company image in the community. The final goal of social marketing is the resolution of social problems or to make sure that measures are taken for these problems. Despite the differences among the concepts, when considering the practice, it is a fact that each concept needs the others when carrying out its activities and that they benefit from each other. Additionally, the main characteristic of these four concepts is to create benefit for the community, to make contribution for a better community and environment.

In the light of all explanations made above, a table has been created below to summarize the points mentioned above and to show the differences and similarities among four concepts. With this table, it is aimed to simplify the matter for the reader to understand and start a discussion on this subject in the academic community. Thus, it is hoped that the differences and similarities among these concepts will be more clear thanks to the researches and discussions to be made in the future on this subject.

**Table 1: Similarities and Differences Chart**

Criteria	Social Marketing	CSR	CRM	PR
<b>Implementer</b>	Mostly government and non-profit organizations	Mostly profit-making organizations	Profit-making organizations	All non-profit and for-profit organizations
<b>Continuity of operations</b>	Temporarily for non-profit organizations	Continuous	Temporarily	Continuous
<b>The primary goal</b>	The abandonment of an existing behavior, behavior change, gaining a new behavior.	To provide benefits to all stakeholders	To provide benefit for the focused group. To find a solution to societal problems.	Creating a positive image in the community.
<b>The ultimate goal</b>	To provide benefit to individuals, groups, and society as a whole.	To create a brand. Enter to new market. To achieve qualified personnel. To increase sales and profits	Creating brand image. To provide confidence. To improve customer relationships. To create loyal customers and to increase sales.	Creating brand image. To provide confidence. To improve both internal and external customer relationships. To create loyal customers and to increase sales.
<b>The utility of company products and services</b>	-----	-----	The utility of company's products and services.	The utility of company's products and services from time to time.
<b>Measurement of the activities</b>	The long-term behavior change.	The effect of activity on sales and profit.	The effect of activity on profit, sales and the brand image.	The effect of activity profit, sales and the brand image.
<b>Target audience</b>	The focus group.	All intra and external stakeholders.	Mostly external groups.	Both intra and external stakeholders.
<b>Funding</b>	Funded by taxes and donations.	Funded by investments.	Funded by investments.	Funded by investments.
<b>Common aspects</b>	To provide benefits to the society as a whole. To contribute for a better society and environment.			

Source: The table was created using Andreassen (2006), Grigore (2011), Kotler (2002), Gifford (1999), Mckie and Toledaro (2008), Tengilimoğlu ve Öztürk (2008) sources.

### References

ADEL I. El-Ansary (1974), "Towards a Definition of Social and Societal Marketing", *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, (3), 316-321.

AKTAN, C.C. and BÖRÜ, D. (2007), *Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, İşletmeler ve Sosyal Sorumluluk*, Editör: Coşkun Can Aktan, İGİAD Yayınları:4, İstanbul.

ANDREASEN, A.R. (2006), *Social Marketing In The 21.st Century*, Sage Publication.

ARGÜDEN, Y. (2007), *Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, İşletmeler ve Sosyal Sorumluluk*, Editör: Coşkun Can Aktan, İGİAD Yayınları:4, İstanbul.

BAKKER, F.G.A, GROENEWEGEN, P. and HOND, F.D. (2005), “A Bibliometric Analysis of 30 Years of Research and Theory on Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Social Performance”, *Business&Society*, 44(3), September, 283-317.

BALI, S. and CINEL, M.O.(2011), “Bir Rekabet Aracı Olarak Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk”, *ODÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), İnternet Adresi: <http://sobiad.odu.edu.tr>, Erişim Tarihi: 25.10.2011.

CAROLL, A.B. (1991), “The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward The Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders”, *Business Horizons*, July-August, 39-48.

CHERON, E., KOHLBACHER, F. and KUSUMA, K. (2012), “The Effects of Brand – Cause Fit and Campaign Duration On Consumer Perception of Cause Related Marketing In Japan”, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(5), 357-368.

COMMISSION OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, Communication from the Commission Concerning Corporate Social Responsibility: A Business Contribution to Sustainable Development, 2.07.2002; Internet Address: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>., Accessed Date: 06.11.2012.

CORBISHLEY, K.M. (2007), Consumer Behaviour Towards Cause Related Marketing In The Greater Ethekweni Region, Dissertation Submitted In Partial Compliance With The Requirements For The Master’s Degree of Technology: Marketing, In The Department of Marketing, Durban University of Technology, Durban.

DANN, S. (2005), Social Change Marketing In The Age Of Direct Benefit Marketing- Where To From Here? In Proceedings Social Change In The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference, QUT Cardine.

ESER, Z. and ÖZDOĞAN, F.B.(2006), *Sosyal Pazarlama Toplumun Refahı ve Kaliteli Yaşamı İçin*, Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION, Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions, A Renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility, Brussels, 25.10.2011; Internet Address: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>., Accessed Date: 06.11.2012.

GODFREY, P.C., HATCH, N.W. and HANSEN, J.M. (2010), “Toward A General Theory of CSRs , The Roles of Beneficence, Profitability, Insurance, and Industry Heterogeneity”, *Business&Society*, 49(2), 316-344.

GRIGORE, G.F. (2011), *Corporate Social Responsibility and Marketing, Governance in the Business Environment Developments in Corporate Governance and Responsibility*, (2), 41-58. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Internet Address: <http://emeraldinsight.com>, Accessed Date: 06.11.2012.

İLTER, B. and BAYRAKTAROĞLU, G.(2007), “Kar Amacı Gütmeyen Sosyal İçerikli Pazarlama Uygulamaları: Sosyal Pazarlama”, Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, (28), January-June, 49-64.

KELGÖKMEN, D.(2010), “İşletmelerin Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Literatür Taraması”, Ege Akademik Bakış, 10(1), 303-318.

KOCABAŞ, F., ELDEN, M. ve YURDAKUL, N.(1999), Reklam ve Halkla İlişkilerde Hedef Kitle, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

KOTLER, P.and ZALTMAN, G. (1971), “Social Marketing: An Approach To Planned Social Change”, Journal of Marketing, (35), 3-12.

KOTLER, P., ROBERTO, N. and LEE, N.(2002), Social Marketing, Improving The Quality of Life, Sage Publication Inc.

KOTLER, P. and LEE, N.R. (2010), Yoksulluğa Karşı Sosyal Pazarlama, (Çev. Zeynep Kökkaya Chalar), MediaCat Yayınları.

MCKIE, David and TOLEDANO, Margalit (2008), “Dangerous Liaison Or Perfect Match? Public Relations And Social Marketing”, Public Relations Review, (34), 318-324.

MOHR, L.A.,WEBB, D.J. and HARIS, K.E. (2001), “Do Consumers Expect Companies To Be Socially Responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior”, The Journal of Consumer Affairs, (35/1), 45- 72.

ODABAŞI, Y.and OYMAN, M. (2005), Pazarlama İletişimi Yönetimi, MediaCat Yayınları, 5.Baskı, İstanbul.

ÖZDEMİR, H. (2009), “Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluğun Marka İmajına Etkisi”, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8(15), 57-72.

POLONSKY, M.J: and SPEED, R. (2001), “Linking Sponsorship and Cause Related Marketing, Complementarities and Conflicts”, European Journal of Marketing, 35(11/12), 1361-1385.

SVENSSON, G. and WOOD, G. (2011), “A Model of Cause Related Marketing For “Profit Driven” and “Nonprofit” Organizations”, European Business Review, 23(2), 203-214.

TAŞKIN, E.and KAHRAMAN, H. (2008), “Amaca Yönelik Pazarlama ve Turkcell Örneği”, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (20), 237-255.

TENGİLİMOĞLU, D. and ÖZTÜRK, Y.(2008), İşletmelerde Halkla İlişkiler, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.

YUNUS, M. and WEBER, K.(2012), Sosyal İşletme Kurmak, İnsanlığın En Acil İhtiyaçlarını Karşılacak Yeni Bir Kapitalizm Türü (Çev. Dr. Ahmet Nebil İmre), Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık.