Author: MASSARO SIMONE

Drink responsibly communication campaigns: a perfect cocktail of brand promotion and social responsibility

Tutor: BRIOSCHI ARIANNA

Theses discussed a.y. 2011-2012

Introduction

Since both a consistent portion of consumers and public health advocates held alcohol industry in a very low regard (Lipman, 1991) because of the problems often associated with the consumption of alcoholic beverages, beer companies started to concentrate part of their marketing efforts in the realization of ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, in order to soften the increasing criticisms and to improve their corporate image. Since then, beer producers have continued to employ increasingly more these communication strategies, but it seems that these ‘socially responsible’ approaches have convinced more the general public than public health organizations. In a recent report 1, for instance, EUCAM – the European Centre for monitoring Alcohol Marketing – warned that similar CSR practices employed by the tobacco industry have been proven to be ineffective and counterproductive. The main issue that worried EUCAM and other public health organizations arises from the fact that, even though the effects of these campaigns have not been sufficiently investigated yet, for analogy with similar practices utilized by the tobacco industry 2 they may be considered to have little or no effects in promoting true awareness about alcohol-related problems, serving instead uniquely the industry’s objectives of brand and product promotion. Also, “an additional problem that comes with CSR of alcohol producers is that it treads uncharted territory and as such lends many opportunities to circumvent existing regulations on alcohol marketing” (EUCAM Report, 2009). In this sense, the dispute between public-health advocates and beer producers is still open, with the former supporting the idea that these campaigns are deliberately ineffective and created ad hoc to promote product consumption, increase brand market share and, at the same time, to soften criticisms, and the latter defending their conduct and


2 Even though there are several differences between alcohol and tobacco, both ‘industries’ sell products that are dangerous to the consumers’ health, and they are both similarly involved in corporate social responsibility campaigns to defend their business.

‘Literature shows that the ‘industry’ – the alcohol and tobacco companies- have traditionally worked closely together, sharing information and concerns about regulation. They have used similar arguments to defend their products in order to prevent or delay restrictions being placed on them”(Bond, et al., 2010).
claiming that their ‘socially responsible’ campaigns are instead “strategically sound, evidence based and not designed to simply grab headlines”\(^3\). In conclusion, while alcohol industry uses these campaigns to demonstrate its commitment in reducing inappropriate consumption and alcohol-related harms, governmental institutions assert that these practices are merely new marketing tools aimed at improving the industry’s image and reputation. The debate is still unsolved even because - as Atkin et al. (2008) suggested - there is a lack of concrete studies on the impact that these ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns may have on the audience, even though it should be of great interest for both beer marketers and public health organizations\(^4\). However, if the two positions are opposite and incompatible, the best key to the reading on the topic may be provided by a direct analysis on the other actors involved in the issue: the consumers. Accordingly, the present study tries to fill the cognitive gap with an empiric research aimed at investigating consumers’ evaluations and interpretations about ‘alcohol moderation’ messages promoted by beer industry, in order to obtain findings valuable from both a public health and a corporate point of view.

**Literature review and research questions**

The main criticisms advanced to industry-sponsored ‘drink responsibly’ campaigns concern the way in which these ‘moderation’ messages are constructed; in particular, most researchers argue that whatever pro-health information these campaigns provide is undermined in subtle ways or overwhelmed by pro-drinking messages (Postman et al., 1987; Kilbourne, 1991; DeJong et al.,1992) and positive alcohol expectancies (Atkin et al., 2008; Zwarun, 2010). Therefore, according to these critics, such messages do not cause any positive change in consumers’ drinking behaviours, serving instead only as new ‘marketing tools’. The purpose of this research is therefore to test whether these criticisms are well-founded and to reach a better understanding on the way in which consumers interpret and react to ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, investigating the main outcomes of the perceived messages in terms of consumers’ attitudes towards the sponsoring firm and of eventual positive changes in their drinking behaviours. In doing that, the study has developed the general guidelines indicated by the recent reference literature and has integrated these theoretical insights with an empiric experiment. In this perspective, the research questions that will orientate this work are the following:

---


\(^4\) Also, as Park et al. (2010) stated, “while a comprehensive body of literature has addressed the effects of alcohol brand advertising or public service announcements (PSAs) on the ‘drink responsibly’ campaigns, work that explicitly considers the effects of alcohol industry-sponsored responsibility advertising is limited”
‘How do consumers interpret beer industry-sponsored ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns? What are the effects of these campaigns?’

The research will therefore focus on the aspects related to consumers’ perceptions and on the consequences of these campaigns. More in particular, the study will investigate the issues regarding:

- Consumers’ interpretations about message content (1)
- Consumers’ evaluations of sponsor’s motives (2)
- Effects of these campaigns (3)

With regard to the first issue, the hypothesis of this study arises from the concept of ‘strategic ambiguity’ (Eisemberg, 1984), which refers to the purposeful use of messages with high levels of abstraction and ambiguity that allows the sender to simultaneously achieve different—and often contrasting—objectives. Strategic ambiguity is produced through the interaction between source, message and receiver variables and it permits the creation of messages that may generate multiple interpretations in multiple audiences. According to Zwarun (2010), in the context of ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, “such messages are strategically ambiguous due to their ability to simultaneously deliver a brand message and a responsible drinking message”. Strategic ambiguity is therefore aimed at achieving multiple and disparate goals through the same message. While governmental organizations and public health institutions should logically pursue the only objective of promoting awareness about responsible consumption, there is at least a reasonable doubt that beer companies could have in mind even commercial purposes of brand and product promotion. Therefore, campaigns that are supposed to convey the same ‘responsibility’ message could be constructed in different ways because of the differences in senders’ purposes: in particular, industry-sponsored campaigns could include not only ‘responsibility’ and ‘moderation’ messages—as it should be found for Public Service Announcements—but also pro-drinking elements and positive alcohol expectancies. This ‘strategic ambiguity’ of beer industry-sponsored campaigns should therefore result in a wide variety of interpretations about the content of the message, which will be perceived to simultaneously convey multiple and disparate meanings. Based on this reasoning, the following hypothesis is offered:

- **H1-A:** There will be higher diversity and multiplicity in consumers’ interpretations about the message content for the industry-sponsored ‘moderation’ campaign than for the analogous PSA, which, instead, will be perceived to convey almost uniquely a ‘responsibility’ message.
Whereas this first hypothesis predicts the finding of multiple interpretations about the message content within the audience, this study goes further and hypothesizes also the presence of different perceptions among different audience segments. In the recent literature on the topic, both Agostinelli et al. (2002) and Smith et al. (2006) posited the occurrence of differential responses by age level. Nevertheless, the use of this variable did not bring any particularly interesting result. The idea of this study is to employ a different variable that is expected to differentiate the audience’s perceptions about the message content of this kind of advertisement. The variable that will be considered is ‘drinking habits’, in particular in reference to the amount of alcohol consumed by a costumer and his likelihood of being engaged in ‘binge’ drinking behaviours\(^5\). The idea has emerged at first during the qualitative research: in fact, it has been noted that, among the interviewed individuals, those who used to drink more or ‘binged’ more frequently were more likely to notice the ‘pro-drinking’ aspects of the industry-sponsored campaigns, if compared with those who used to drink moderately. When asked why they thought they had seen pro-drinking messages in the advertisements, the main reason they provided as explanation was that they recognized themselves or some of their friends in the situations showed in the campaigns, and this fact made them remember the funny nights spent drinking in group, instead of make them reflect about the potential negative consequences of drinking excessively. In fact, these campaigns usually depict situations of extreme inebriation and imply that being excessively drunk may lead to both physical harms and social disapproval.

However, a recent research conducted by the Universities of Bath, London and Birmingham\(^6\) found out that these advertisements may be dramatically misconceived, especially among the segment of youngsters who have excessive drinking habits. In fact, as Christine Griffin, professor at the University of Bath, suggests, “not only does being in a friendship group legitimise being very drunk; being the subject of an extreme drinking story can raise esteem within the group”. It is therefore reasonable to expect that youngsters who are frequently involved in risky drinking behaviours and who recognize themselves and their friends in the situations showed in these ‘moderation’ campaigns may be more likely to catch the eventual pro-drinking themes included in this kind of advertisements. Based on this logic, it is therefore hypothesized that:

- **H1-B: In the industry-sponsored campaign, consumers who use to drink more and who are more likely to be engaged in excessive drinking behaviours will notice the pro-drinking aspects of the message to a greater extent in**

---

\(^5\) Wechsler et al. (1995) define ‘binge drinking’ as “four or more drinks in a row for women and five or more drinks in a row for men”. According to Anderson (2007), binge drinking is the fast assumption of more than 50g of alcohol in a short period of time.

\(^6\) Research funded by the Economic & Social Research Council and published on Alcohol Alert (2008) by the Institute of Alcohol Studies,
comparison with consumers who already have ‘moderate’ drinking habits, that instead will see the ‘responsibility’ message as the main communicated meaning.

In the debate concerning sponsors’ real motives for producing this kind of ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, most critics argue that, behind these campaigns, there are three main objectives: first, “brewers may seek to maximize sales of the company brand by increasing both specific brand share and overall product demand” (Smith et al., 2006); second, a beer company could try to improve its corporate image and reputation by communicating concern for its consumers’ well-being, establishing itself as a respectable and socially responsible company (Atkin et al., 2008). Finally, besides these profit-oriented purposes there could be also the third and most manifest goal declared by the industry of actually diminishing alcohol-related harms and consequences such as injuries, health problems and antisocial acts (DeJong et al., 1992; Smith et al., 2006; Atkin et al., 2008). This last objective reflects actual concern from the company and it can therefore be considered as an ‘intrinsic’ and altruistic motive; on the other side, the former two categories of motivations can be associated with marketing and public relations purposes and they can consequently be labelled as ‘extrinsic’ and self-serving motives. In general, consumers may and do infer the motivations behind an advertisement, which can be either extrinsic or intrinsic (Atkin et al., 2008). Past researches showed that individuals attribute motivations to companies committed in cause-related campaigns (Rifon et al., 2004) and, in doing that, they may adopt a more sceptical approach if the message conveyed in the campaign at first appears to run against the advertiser’s selling purposes. It is therefore presumable that messages promoting ‘moderation’ in drinking alcoholic beverages sponsored by a company whose business consists in selling beer may generate doubts and perplexity in the cognitive process aimed at inferring sponsor’s motivations. Since it has been argued that these campaigns are constructed with the use of ‘strategic ambiguity’, in consistency with this theoretical construct it could be assumed that consumers will infer a multiplicity of interpretations about sponsor’s motivations behind these ‘social responsibility’ practices. Therefore, they may be doubtful and torn between a general appreciation for the social and intrinsic goals of the campaign and a simultaneous distrust caused by the perception of possible opportunistic and extrinsic purposes - such as marketing and public relations motives. Hence, the following hypothesis is offered:

---

7 The industry asserts to employ these CSR practices because it cares about its consumers, but also because it is in its own interest to address the drinking agenda and avoid that a minority of people who drink excessively put in a bad light an otherwise-healthy and unproblematic product.
H2: As regards the industry-sponsored campaign, consumers’ interpretations of sponsor’s motives will be manifold and contrasting, with the simultaneous perception of both intrinsic and extrinsic motives.

The last and most important issue to investigate in this research concerns the effects of these ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns on both sponsor’s corporate image and consumers’ drinking behaviours. In fact, whereas beer companies should be interested in understanding whether their corporate image and reputation are enhanced or impoverished by this kind of CSR initiatives, governmental and public health organizations should want to find out if these campaigns may serve the purpose of limiting excessive and harmful drinking practices and could actually generate positive outcomes in terms of moderation and responsibility. With regards to the first aspect, the thesis of this study, - conversely to the hypotheses recently advanced by critics⁸ – is that, notwithstanding the multiplicity of interpretations about sponsor’s motives, these campaigns will generally enhance the corporate image and will generate positive attitudes towards the sponsoring company. Hence, this study hypothesizes the following:

H3-A: ‘Drink responsibly’ communication campaigns will not bring any impoverishment on corporate image even in presence of perceptions of company’s opportunistic behaviours. Despite the multiple and divergent interpretations about sponsor’s motives, consumers’ evaluations and attitudes toward the company will be uniformly positive.

Finally, the research will try to understand whether or not these ‘moderation’ campaigns may generate positive changes in consumers’ drinking behaviour. To those critics and organizations that asserted that industry-sponsored campaigns are too ambiguous and appealing to be effective (Wallack, 1991; DeJong et al., 1992; Wolburg, 2005; Smith et al., 2006) alcohol companies have answered with concrete data that demonstrate the opposite⁹. Hence, proceeding from the body of literature on the differences in the construction of industry-sponsored ‘moderation’ campaigns and analogous PSA, this study will try to empirically investigate the effects – and the differences in the effects – of ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns created by a beer company and by a governmental

---

⁸ The recent body of literature on the topic, in fact, claims that, if consumers perceive the presence of self-serving and opportunistic motives behind these apparently ‘socially responsible’ campaigns, there is the concrete risk that sponsor’s corporate image and reputation would be damaged.

⁹ Heineken, which carried out researches before and after the launch of its ‘Know The Signs’ alcohol-moderation campaign, highlights that these researches showed “a big shift in attitudes towards alcohol consumption and a significant impact on actual consumption amongst those who had interacted with the campaign”. For instance, “those who said ‘they put a limit on the number of drinks they’ll have before the night begins’ increased by 31%.”
organization. To this regard, based on the existing reference literature and on the findings suggested by the qualitative interviews, the following hypothesis is offered:

- **H3-B**: *Industry-sponsored ‘moderation’ campaign will be less effective than the analogous PSA in promoting true awareness about alcohol-related harms and in stimulating changes in dangerous drinking behaviours. There will be greater propensity to drink ‘moderately’ after the vision of the PSA than after the industry-sponsored message, which instead will not cause significant decrease of drinking intentions.*

**Methodology**

The first step in the development of the empiric research has been the realization of ten qualitative interviews, in order to better frame consumers’ attitudes towards ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns and therefore to understand how to structure the research design. Afterwards, an empiric experiment has been carried out, confronting an industry-sponsored ‘moderation’ advertisement (Heineken’s ‘Know The Signs’) with an analogous Public Service Announcement (‘Know Your Limits’) in order to verify the presence of eventual differences in the construction of the two messages and in their effects on the audience. 153 youngsters between 16 and 30 years old have been asked to watch the two different advertisements and to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire was structured in three main parts: the first investigated consumers’ drinking habits, while the second and the third part collected respondents’ evaluations and reactions respectively on Heineken’s campaign and on the PSA.

**Results**

The first hypothesis of the research (**H1-A**) predicted that viewers would infer a higher multiplicity and diversity of interpretations about the content of the message for the industry-sponsored campaign than for the analogous PSA. In particular, it was hypothesized that respondents would see almost uniquely messages of ‘responsibility’ in the public service announcement, whereas in the Heineken’s campaign they would notice the presence of both ‘moderation’ messages and ‘pro-drinking’ elements’. In fact, the hypothesized employment of ‘strategic ambiguity’ in the construction of the industry-sponsored advertisement may allow the simultaneous perception of different – and even
conflicting meanings in the same message. To test this, consumers’ perceptions on the content of the message of the two campaigns were confronted, and the results actually confirmed almost entirely the hypotheses. In fact, as evidenced by the graph below, the elements of ‘moderation’ were noticed in similar measure in both campaigns – with just a slight prevalence in the PSA – whereas the presence of pro-drinking messages was perceived to be definitely predominant in the Heineken’s campaign and almost absent in the PSA.

However, the same graph shows also that the initial hypothesis was not completely confirmed: in fact, even though it is undeniable that pro-drinking elements are largely predominant in the industry-sponsored campaign, it is also true that they have been perceived to be present even in the PSA, which evidently conveys almost exclusively a message of ‘moderation’ and ‘responsibility’, but also – even if only in minor measure – positive alcohol expectancies.

It can therefore be concluded that H1-A is partially supported: even though pro-drinking elements were perceived in small measure also in the PSA, overall the ‘Know Your Limits’ campaign has been shown to convey almost exclusively messages of ‘moderation’, whereas the industry-sponsored campaign has been perceived to be a mix of ‘moderation’ messages and positive alcohol expectancies.

H1-B predicted that, as regards the industry-sponsored advertisement, respondents who used to drink more or who were more likely to be engaged in excessive drinking behaviours – such as ‘binge drinking’ – would notice the pro-drinking aspects of the message to a greater extent in comparison with respondents who already had moderate drinking habits. Also, it has been hypothesized that, on the contrary, respondents who used to drink less would notice in larger measure the ‘moderation’ messages of the

---

10 The criticisms expressed by the researchers from the University of Bath (http://www.alcoholpolicy.net/2008/05/scepticism-over.html) were therefore in part confirmed. Probably the presence of ‘humour’ in the PSA has allowed the perception of pro-drinking elements in the message.
campaign. To test these hypotheses, respondents’ perceptions on the message content have been crosschecked with their drinking habits, and in particular with the amount of alcohol usually consumed during the weekend (expressed in U.A.) and with the frequency with which they ‘binged’ during last month (times/month). The results of the quantitative research actually confirmed the hypotheses and two precise trends were found: with the increasing of the quantity of alcohol consumed, respondents’ likeliness to notice the pro-drinking aspects of the message continuously augmented; at the same time, the more they used to drink, the less they noticed the messages of ‘moderation’ and ‘responsibility’ of the advertisement. It is therefore safe to state that **H1-B** is fully supported. The following graphs provide a few examples to illustrate the clearness of the trends:

- **PRO-DRINKING ELEMENTS → POSITIVE TREND**

  ![Graph of pro-drinking elements](image)

- **MODERATION ELEMENTS → NEGATIVE TREND**

  ![Graph of moderation elements](image)

**H2** predicted that viewers of Heineken’s ‘Know The Signs’ would infer manifold and contrasting interpretations about sponsor’ motivations behind the advertisement, with the simultaneous perception of both intrinsic (pro-social) and extrinsic (self-serving) motives. Even though most respondents selected self-serving motives as predominant in the realization of the campaign, when asked to indicate the nature (intrinsic or extrinsic) of sponsors’ motivations, nearly all of them chose the simultaneous presence of both types.
As illustrated in the following graph, eight out of ten respondents indicated the simultaneous presence of both intrinsic and extrinsic sponsors’ motives for the realization of the campaign. H2 is therefore supported.

H3-A predicted that Heineken ‘alcohol moderation’ campaign would not bring any impoverishment on corporate image nor losses in intentions to buy Heineken’s products even in presence of consumers’ perceptions of ‘extrinsic’ and ‘self-serving’ motives. Even in this case, the results supported the hypothesis. Overall, both consumers’ buying intentions and Heineken’s corporate image were enhanced (or, at least, unchanged) after the vision of the advertisement in the vast majority of the cases, as evidenced by the following graphs:

More specifically, respondents’ attitudes toward Heineken and their intentions to buy the products of the company that sponsored the advertisement were crosschecked with participants’ perception of extrinsic and intrinsic motives, but no significant result was found. This confirmed the hypothesis that, despite the multiple and divergent interpretations about sponsor’s motives, consumers’ evaluations and attitudes toward the company would be uniformly positive and there would not be any particular impoverishment in corporate image and buying intentions. It is therefore safe to state that the results fully supported H3-A.

Finally, H3-B predicted that the industry-sponsored campaign would be less effective than the analogous PSA in promoting true awareness about alcohol-related harms. It was
therefore hypothesized the finding of greater propensity to ‘drink moderately’ after the vision of the ‘Know Your Limits’ campaign rather than after Heineken’s ‘Know The Signs’. In order to test this, respondents were asked to express their agreement on a series of statements about the effects of the two campaigns. Once again, the results confirmed the hints emerged from the qualitative research and this last hypothesis. For instance, 78% of the respondents agreed that ‘This video made me understand that excessive drinking is harmful’ after the vision of the PSA, versus a 38% who declared the same after the vision of Heineken’s advertisement. The following graph highlights the differences in the effects between the two campaigns in terms of promotion of ‘responsible drinking’.

On the contrary, for what concerns participants’ intentions to drink alcohol after the vision of the two advertisements, results show that Heineken ‘Know The Signs’ stimulated definitely more its viewers to go out and drink something (27.5% of the respondents) than the analogous PSA (6.6%).

Finally, combining respondents’ level of agreement (from 1=’strongly disagree’ to 5= ‘strongly agree’) on the different statements about their ‘proneness to drink moderately’ and their ‘will to drink’ after the vision of the campaigns, it appears evident that, overall, the industry-sponsored campaign is way less effective than the PSA in promoting awareness and stimulating changes in dangerous drinking behaviours. On the contrary, it stimulates viewers’ intentions to drink alcohol definitely more than the ‘Know Your Limits’ campaign. H3-B is therefore fully supported, as evidenced by the following graph.
Conclusions and perspectives

In this research on consumers’ evaluations and reactions to ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, the first issue investigated concerned the content of the message of the two advertisements. To this regard, the results actually confirmed the relating hypotheses: whereas ‘Know Your Limits’, the PSA employed as stimulus for the research, was found to convey almost exclusively a message of moderation and responsibility, the ‘similar’ campaign sponsored by Heineken was perceived to be more ‘ambiguous’, with the inclusion of ‘positive alcohol expectancies’ (Zwarun, 2010) and pro-drinking elements that in some cases even stimulated consumers’ intentions to drink beer. Also, it was found that consumers who used to drink more and who were more likely to be engaged in excessive drinking behaviour noticed the pro-drinking aspects of the industry-sponsored advertisement to a greater extent in comparison with those who already had ‘moderate’ drinking habits. In this way, Heineken was able to send to the ‘moderate’ audience a message of responsibility, while, at the same time, winning sympathy and empathy in the eyes of the heaviest consumers\(^\text{11}\), that is, the best clients in terms of profits.

In conclusion, the Public Service Announcement, obviously constructed with the only goal in mind of promoting awareness about alcohol-related problems, resulted to convey really almost uniquely a message of responsibility. On the contrary, Heineken campaign was found to be more ‘strategically ambiguous’ and constructed with elements of ‘moderation’ mixed with positive ‘alcohol expectancies’. This probably reflects the fact that, in the creation of its ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns, Heineken wants to

\(^{11}\) ‘Worldwide, 30% of all drinkers consume the 80% of the total alcohol: it is therefore evident that a large part of the industry’s profit relies on ‘irresponsible’ and heavy consumers’. Data from the University of Southampton, presented at the conference Alcohol and Health, Amsterdam, 2010.
simultaneously pursue different objectives, such as actually promoting responsibility, dispelling criticisms, improving corporate image and stimulating product consumption.

For what concern consumers’ evaluations of sponsor’s motivations, even though the perception of extrinsic and opportunistic motives was predominant in respondents’ evaluations, hardly any negative outcome has been found in terms of consumers’ attitudes towards the sponsoring firm and in purchasing intentions. Contrarily to what hypothesized in recent studies (Landman et al., 2002; Atkin et al., 2008; Park et al., 2010), these industry-sponsored ‘drink responsibly’ communication campaigns do not represent a risk for sponsor’s reputation and business even in presence of consumers’ perceptions of opportunistic and self-serving motives. On the contrary, the results showed that both corporate image and purchasing intentions are generally enhanced or unchanged\textsuperscript{12} after the vision of these ‘socially responsible’ advertisements, which, at the same time, presumably augment brand recognition, functioning similarly to standard product advertising\textsuperscript{13}.

In conclusion, from a public health perspective, from this study emerges that industry-sponsored ‘moderation’ campaigns are not sufficiently effective in actually promoting awareness about alcohol-related problems and in discouraging dangerous drinking behaviours. They therefore should be reformulated and created without the inclusion of ‘strategically ambiguous’ messages, positive alcohol expectancies and other pro-drinking elements. On the other side, from a corporate point of view, these campaigns are useful tools for simultaneously achieving different objectives; first of all, they serve the public relations functions of softening criticisms and lending a positive light on the industry in the eyes of the general public. Secondly, these advertisements serve the marketing purposes of promoting sponsor’s brand and enhancing corporate image. Lastly, but not less importantly, promoting responsibility and simultaneously inserting positive portrayals of product consumption, beer companies are able to pursue the objectives of being perceived as ‘socially responsible’ and reducing the harms caused by alcohol misuse, without at the same time truly undermining most forms of beer consumption.

This study has the merit of empirically integrating the reference literature with a direct research on consumers’ evaluations of industry-sponsored alcohol moderation campaign, but it also presents several limitations that need to be addressed in future studies. First of all, the topic is so important for all the actors involved that it requires a definitely more exhaustive research. For instance, little more than one hundred and fifty participants were

\textsuperscript{12} Corporate Image: 95% Enhanced or Unchanged; 5% Worsened.
Purchasing Intentions: 98% Increased or Unchanged, 2% Decreased.

\textsuperscript{13} This aspect was not investigated in the research, but, as EUCAM suggests, ‘by including the brand name in social responsible campaigns, brand awareness and brand recognition are raised. Therefore, it is safe to label such campaigns as advertisements’ (EUCAM, 2009a).
interviewed for the empiric experiment; future studies should instead employ a larger and more representative sample. Also, the issue is strongly controversial and therefore need additional investigations to be fully analysed and comprehended. In particular, while in this study most measures were created to simply provide a general knowledge on the investigated issues, more precise and sophisticated measurement scales – such as those commonly used in the marketing literature to assess attitudinal outcomes - should be employed to fully understand consumers’ evaluations and reactions to these ‘drink responsibly’ communications. A further limitation of this study lies in the fact that the empiric research has employed as stimuli only a single example of ‘drink responsibly’ campaign sponsored by a beer company and a single example of Public Service Announcement: for obvious reasons, the results cannot therefore be fully extended and generalized; additional studies are still needed to provide more solid evidences.

Nevertheless, in the not-yet-developed context of studies about industry-sponsored alcohol moderation campaigns, the present work succeeded in providing useful findings and hints for further in-depth researches, serving as orientation for future investigations on this controversial issue.