Quit and Win contests are social marketing campaigns that have met with great success in achieving smoking cessation. They have been organized in over 80 countries around the world, have had over 2 million smokers participate, and have helped an estimated 150,000 smokers quit. Quit and Win contests work by offering prize incentives and a supportive environment to smokers who wish to quit smoking. This article examines the structural components of Quit and Win programs that make them successful social marketing campaigns, along with the measures used to determine their success. Recommendations are provided for increasing the success of Quit and Win programs in the future. This review also provides useful lessons for the development of other types of social marketing campaigns.
contests overcome this problem by offering smokers a short-term prize incentive and quitting support. The potential to win a prize helps to offset the immediate discomforts of quitting (Lando, Hellerstedt et al. 1991).

Despite the widespread use and importance of social marketing, inadequate documentation and publicity still exists about successful social marketing campaigns (Andreason 2002). The success of Quit and Win contests represents an exciting social marketing success story. It is important that success stories, like Quit and Win contests, be documented and analyzed so that social marketers may learn from them. Lessons learned from Quit and Win contests can be applied to many other areas of social marketing.

To be deemed successful, social marketing should not simply convey a social message but must elicit behavior change. This article discusses how Quit and Win campaigns have been structured for success using these properties. Using Andreason’s (2002) social marketing success criteria, we analyze the structures and success rates of Quit and Win campaigns and make recommendations for improving success in the future. This analysis relies primarily on the published literature on Quit and Win contests, located through extensive searches on a variety of databases including ABI-Inform, PubMed, PsychInfo, and others.

Social Marketing Campaign Structure
According to Andreason (2002), the hallmarks of a successful social marketing campaign include:

1. Using behavior as a benchmark for design and evaluation.
2. Using all four Ps (product, price, place, and promotion).
3. Carefully segmenting the target audience.
5. Using extensive research about the audience and the competition.

All elements of Andreason’s (2002) social marketing campaign structure are evident in Quit and Win programs. First, the campaign is designed to facilitate behavioral change in the form of smoking cessation. The amount of smoking cessation that takes place is directly correlated with the number of smoker participants who enter the contest, meaning that participation should be a primary focus of international Quit and Win programs (Hey and Perera 2005). Organizing sponsors are provided with a set of rules and regulations, along with other support materials intended to aid in maximizing participation rates.
Second, all four Ps are taken into consideration. Contest entry and quitting support services (product) are offered to participants at no cost (price), thanks to the efforts of the contest’s organizing sponsors. A variety of media are used to communicate with potential participants during the recruitment process (promotion), and entry forms are made available at a wide variety of locations (place).

Third, research collected during prior campaigns is used to inform the recruitment process, making it possible to better appeal to the quitting motives of prospects with higher success likelihoods. The target audience is segmented according to a variety of factors, informed by research.

Fourth, prize incentives offer smokers an attractive and immediate motive to quit. The smoker exchanges his or her unhealthy habit for a lifestyle change and a chance to win prizes. This exchange provides both short-term and long-term benefits to the smoker.

Fifth, smoking behavior is measured at the beginning and end of the contest, as well as one year later to evaluate campaign success and inform future campaign design. Ongoing research tracks the success of Quit and Win programs.

The following sections outline the structural components of Quit and Win contests that contribute to their high success rates. The contests are designed around:

- Organizing sponsors that champion the campaign.
- Rules and regulations provided to sponsors for contest implementation.
- Promotional materials and recruitment methods.
- Contest participants.
- System of awarding prizes.
- Means of monitoring participant smoking behavior.
- Procedures for follow-up measurement to evaluate the program’s long-term behavioral impact, to inform future campaigns.

But first, we examine the background of Quit and Win campaigns to better understand the origins and organization.

Organizing sponsors

First introduced in the United States in 1975, Quit and Win contests are coordinated at an international level and national organizers are recruited to run the contests within each country. Whereas each sponsoring organization is in
charge of many elements of its own competition, extensive support is provided to the sponsoring organizations that run the individual contests. A handbook outlines the international components, including the campaign timetable, common rules, international materials, and standardized follow-up procedures (Korhonen et al. 2000). As an international contribution, copies of the international poster are printed and sent out to the participating countries from the international coordinating center.

Organizations that sponsor and assist in the Quit and Win contest are often large national commercial organizations, government departments, environment and health protection agencies, or nongovernmental organizations. These groups then recruit and coordinate smaller local organizations to participate, such as voluntary organizations, sports and recreational organizations, health care services, banks, and the mass media (Tillgren et al. 1995b). However, it is also possible for several smaller sponsoring organizations to operate independently in one country.

Organizations are attracted as sponsors to the contest because they appreciate the opportunity to become involved in important public health work. Sponsoring organizations are needed to help generate staff and financial resources for the contests, while the contests promote the organization’s image as a health promotion leader (Lando, Pechacek, and Fruetel 1994). Sponsors of all types may choose to contribute funds or prizes instead of time in exchange for being listed in campaign materials. The contest and its winners tend to produce a wide variety of human interest stories, which are picked up by the media and provide added local and international opportunities for sponsor recognition (Puska 1999).

Organizing sponsors provide the structural foundation of Quit and Win contests. The more local sponsorship and support a contest organizer generates, the more smokers will be willing to participate (Tillgren et al. 1995b). Participation is a campaign’s primary method of increasing successful quitting attempts in a community, ultimately driving campaign success (Hey and Perera 2005).

Contest rules and regulations
To be eligible to enter a Quit and Win contest, smokers must be of legal smoking age and have been daily smokers for at least one year before the contest (Croghan et al. 2001; Korhonen et al. 2000). All smokers must enter by submitting an entry form by the specified quit date and remain smoke-free for the duration of the four-week contest. At the end of the contest, the participants who have completely abstained from smoking during the contest are entered into a drawing for prizes. To ensure the contestants whose names are drawn for prizes have
actually abstained for the duration of the contest, validation from two witnesses and a carbon monoxide test are required (Korhonen et al. 2000). The names of winners from each country are put into a draw for an international superprize.

Contest promotion
Organizers of Quit and Win contests use a variety of promotional efforts to recruit as many participants as possible. These include mass media, public relations, merchandising, and other support materials. The most common media are ads on TV, radio, and newspaper. Results from a San Diego (CA, USA) county contest found that television was the most effective medium, responsible for recruiting 54% of participants (Tillgren et al. 1995b). Public relations activities such as press releases about past contest winners and successful quitters, and such events as fashion shows and horse races are used to increase awareness and inform people of the contest. Printed materials such as posters, flyers distributed to schools and businesses, leaflets explaining the contest rules, and registration forms are used to recruit smokers into the program (Korhonen et al. 1999); these usually include a phone number or web site address for further information (Croghan et al. 2001; Lando et al. 1994).

Participants are recruited from many different sources, and the recruiting period usually lasts for about three weeks prior to the quit day (Tillgren et al. 1993). Merchandise such as clothing, badges and stickers, and fridge magnets promoting a quit hotline are also distributed throughout the campaign. Educational materials and support systems such as the hotline are also provided to help people quit successfully.

Contest participation
To enter the contest, participants are required to submit entry forms. The forms usually include a description of the official rules (Bains et al. 2000), information about the contest sponsors and prizes, as well as a reminder about the official target quit date (Croghan et al. 2001).

There are many different reasons why smokers enter the contest. In the 1990 United Kingdom contest, the main reasons to stop smoking (in order of most significance) were to win a prize, to save money, because they were encouraged or persuaded by others, because they wanted to see how long they could stop for, because they wanted to cut down on smoking, or because they participated for a charity or as part of a bet (Roberts, Smith, and Catford 1993). Other motives for entering the contest include a concern for the health of self and others, incompatibility of smoking with fitness, to break the smoking habit, to set a good
example for their children, to avoid being social outcasts, wanting to be fresh and clean, to avoid the expense, and to try something new (Chapman et al. 1993). Public policies surrounding smoke-free public places and smoke-free workplaces undoubtedly contribute to the desire among smokers to use Quit and Win contests as a means of quitting smoking (Cummings 1999).

According to research, a variety of strategies are used by participants to prepare for the official quit date (Lando, Pirie et al. 1991). Some smokers reduced the number of cigarettes they smoked and practiced going without cigarettes before the quit date. Participants also thought about personal reasons to quit, relied on others for support, bought cigarette packs instead of cartons, switched to brands with lower tar content, set their own target date for quitting, and made cigarettes harder to get at. To resist smoking during the campaign, participants tried relaxing, exercising, eating and drinking, moving smoking items, staying away from other smokers, and thinking about the benefits of being a nonsmoker. Other research has found that some smokers use methods such as throwing away cigarettes, quitting with someone else, changing coffee habits, and attending stop smoking clinics (Cummings et al. 1990). Evidence from Quit and Win contests has also found that pharmacological aids, including nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), can be very useful in improving quit rates (Gomez-Zamudio et al. 2004; Hawk et al. 2006).

A key concern to contest organizers is that the significant value of the prizes may cause some nonsmokers to illegally enter the competition. In some contests, smokers are required to verify their smoking status before the contest as well as after. This can be accomplished by requesting the signatures of up to three witnesses or obtaining a doctor’s signature and undergoing biochemical testing to verify the participant’s smoking status (Glasgow et al. 1985; Lando et al. 1994). Some Quit and Win programs have a contest for smokers as well as for nonsmokers who wish to support a smoker participating in the contest. The nonsmoker supporter must fill out a separate entry form to take part in the contest and be eligible to win prizes (Korhonen et al. 1999).

Prizes and incentives
At the end of the contest, a computer-generated list of eligible contestants is used to randomly select the potential winners. Potential winners are contacted and asked about their smoking status. Those who report being abstinent usually require a written statement signed by witnesses, to verify their self-report. Due to its expense, biochemical verification is generally reserved only for those finalists who are selected for a major prize (Croghan et al. 2001). Final draws are often
held in a public location with extensive media coverage, since an exciting end helps to promote the contest and encourage more people to join in the next one (Lando et al. 1994).

Major prizes, such as cars and vacations, are donated by sponsoring businesses in exchange for publicity within the campaign materials (Chapman et al. 1993; O'Connor et al. 2006). Ideal prizes are those with mass appeal to all age groups (Lando et al. 1994), including cars, exotic vacations, and monetary prizes. There are usually regional and national prizes, as well as an international cash superprize drawn among the winners of each country (Korhonen and Puska 2000). Lesser prizes have included TV sets, electronics, cookware, gift certificates, amusement park passes (Lai et al. 2000), athletic equipment, free admission to sporting events, free weekends at local hotels, free teeth cleanings, and grocery store coupons (Elder et al. 1991). Small novelty prizes such as T-shirts, mugs, and movie tickets are also sometimes awarded to all the preliminary finalists (Lando et al. 1994).

In contests in which nonsmoking supporters are allowed to enter, the winners are selected in a similar manner. Supporters are usually eligible to win regardless of whether their smoking partner succeeded in quitting (Croghan et al. 2001). In a novel twist in a Bloomington (Minnesota, USA) contest, children who “adopted” a smoker and helped him or her in succeeding to quit smoking could win a mountain bike or a pair of in-line skates (Lando, Pirie et al. 1995).

Monitoring participant behavior
To monitor behavior change among participants, detailed background information about the entrant is often collected on the entry form. Alternatively, entrants may be contacted by telephone shortly after registration to gather the monitoring data needed. Information collected included demographic variables such as age, sex, occupation, and place of residence, as well as behavioral variables such as smoking history, current smoking habits, number and success of previous quit attempts, self-confidence levels, available social support, and outcome expectations (Elder et al. 1991; Glasgow et al. 1985; Tillgren et al. 1995a).

At the end of the contest, telephone or mail surveys are used to measure post-contest smoking status. By comparing the postcontest survey information with entrant information form prior to the contest start, the results can be used to determine the overall success rate of the contest (Elder et al. 1991). In some cases, random telephone surveys are conducted before and after the Quit and Win contest to assess the level of knowledge and attitudes about smoking and to see how these views may have changed after the contest ended (Croghan et al. 2001).
For example, in a San Diego (CA, USA) contest, follow-up telephone interviews took place eight weeks after the quit day, immediately after the prize draw. The interviewer asked questions about recall of media used in the contest, participant demographics, smoking behavior, self-efficacy levels, expectations of the participants, and how important the contest atmosphere had been in his or her attempt to quit. Those surveyed included smokers in the contest, smokers who had heard of the contest but did not enter, and smokers who had neither entered nor heard of the contest (Elder et al. 1991), allowing for intergroup comparisons.

Deception is a concern in Quit and Win contests, particularly with respect to nonsmoker entrants who pretend to be smokers to be eligible for prizes. Self-report validation studies usually report deception rates of around 4% (Chapman et al. 1993). For example, in the 1997 campaign in North Karelia (Finland), only 3% of contest participants turned out to be nonsmokers, and a high degree of consistency was found between the self-reported and biochemical measures for smoking status among the Finnish participants who were sampled (Korhonen et al. 1999). However, a study in New South Wales (Australia) reported that of 300 participants interviewed, 12% admitted to being nonsmokers, and 22% admitted to being ex-smokers who had stopped smoking before entering the contest. Therefore, in total, 34% of the participants were nonsmokers attempting to win a prize for which they were ineligible to compete (Chapman and Smith 1994).

In postcontest surveys, illegal nonsmoker entrants have the potential to skew success rate results. Therefore, to encourage nonsmokers who have illegally entered the contest to admit they have entered on false pretenses, surveys take place after the prizes have already been won, so respondents have nothing to gain from withholding the truth about their smoking status. Respondents are assured that interviewers have no personal interest in whether the respondent is a smoker or not. This allows for surveys to measure the deception rate.

One of the main limitations to obtaining highly accurate data about the true success rates in Quit and Win contests is the lack of biochemical testing of self-reported abstinence for all entrants. The only real deterrent to falsifying reports lies with participants’ awareness before the contest that potential winners will be biochemically tested (Elder et al. 1991). Contest finalists undergo biochemical testing, but it is neither possible, feasible, nor cost efficient to test all participants (Croghan et al. 2001). Therefore, contest organizers accept the limitation that there may be some underreporting of smoking status, which results in higher reported abstinence rates.
One-year follow-up studies and success validation

The international Quit and Win program recommends that a one-year follow-up survey be carried out in participating countries and regions, to assess the abstinence rates (Korhonen and Puska 2000). However, because organizing sponsors in each country finance their own data collection and analysis efforts, lesser developed countries may not be able to afford or staff such surveys (Korhonen et al. 2000). Thus, one-year follow-up surveys are not conducted in every country.

In the one-year follow-up survey, abstinence results are based on self-reported data (Bains et al. 2000). Most countries use mail surveys to collected data, but in some countries telephone interviews and face-to-face interviews are also used. Mail surveys are thought to be subject to less bias than personal interviews, because respondents feel less social pressure in answering an anonymous mail survey. Interviews are not anonymous. Thus, so participants may lie because they feel guilty and do not want the interviewer to know that they failed in their quit attempt or perhaps even lied about being a nonsmoker to begin with (Korhonen et al. 1997). The response rates for the one-year follow-up survey vary from country to country, and in 1997 ranged from 24% to 94% (Korhonen and Puska 2000).

Analyzing Success Rates

Campaign success is determined by the number of people who quit smoking as a result of the contest. The success of a Quit and Win campaign is currently calculated by three main measures:

1. Cessation rates.
2. Participation rates.
3. Cost per participant/cost per quitter.

Cessation rates

Behavior change is the key determinant of the success in a social marketing campaign. Thus, the first measure used to estimate the effectiveness of Quit and Win contests is smoking cessation rates measured at the end of the four-week contest, and also at follow-up periods varying from six months to one year. Follow-up studies for the international contests have shown that an average of 20% of contestants have remained tobacco-free since the beginning of the contest after one year (Quit and Win 2004).

Nonresponse to follow-up surveys can cause difficulty in assessing the success rates of contests. Simply taking the results from respondents may give an overly
optimistic success rate because unsuccessful quitters may have been less willing to respond to the follow-up survey. Therefore, conservative results often include assuming nonrespondents are smokers (Korhonen et al. 2000).

A significant limitation of Quit and Win success measures is it is not cost-effective to verify smoking cessation scientifically for all entrants. Studies that have compared self-reported results to biological results show significant disparities. Hahn et al. (2004) demonstrated a threefold difference between self-reports and biological tests for Quit and Win participants. Quit and Win contestants had self-reported quit rates of 23.3%, whereas biological testing confirmed only an 8.1% rate of quitting. As such, the average one-year cessation rate of 20% reported by Quit and Win organizers may, when adjusted, be as low as 7%. While self-reported results are clearly inflated, they are the most realistic methods of measuring quit rates for the majority of Quit and Win participants before, immediately after, and one year after contest entry.

Cessation rates are by themselves incomplete and potentially misleading. The results from the contests must be compared with the already existing smoking and quitting trends in each community. To see how many smokers quit directly as a result of the contest, an estimate of the average monthly quit rate before the contest must be subtracted from the monthly quit rate after the contest. The excess can then be assumed to be a product of the contest (Chapman et al. 1993). In some studies, a random control group has been used to help predict how many smokers would have quit without the help of the contest (Korhonen et al. 2000). For example, when a contest was implemented in Pitkaranta, (Russia), a neighboring district was used as a comparison to see if the contest really was effective. The self-reported cessation rates of respondents after one year were 26% for Pitkaranta and 2% for the neighboring district (McAlister et al. 2000). These types of results confirm the proposition that Quit and Win campaigns can significantly influence quitting.

Results from various Quit and Win contests have led to the conclusion that certain demographic and smoking behavior characteristics can predict smoking cessation. Several studies have found that older age groups are more likely to quit successfully, as are heavier smokers and long-time smokers (Korhonen et al. 1997). This is perhaps not surprising, since older smokers and heavier smokers are often motivated by health-related reasons to quit smoking.

There are also demographic differences in terms of quitting characteristics across countries, which may arise as a result of different cultural norms related to smoking. Country-specific factors, such as smoking prevalence, tobacco advertising bans, and price and availability of cigarettes, may cause quit rates to vary in
different countries, thereby complicating intercountry comparisons (Sun et al. 2000). Countries in different stages in the antismoking movement may need to adapt the Quit and Win contest to their local environments.

Individual success in quitting appears to vary significantly according to the strategy adopted (in particular, whether contestants stop “cold turkey” or by gradually cutting down). Unsuccessful participants are almost four times more likely than successful ones to attempt to quit smoking by cutting down slowly (Roberts et al. 1993). Other reasons people fail to quit successfully are stress, lack of support from family and friends, the enjoyment gained from smoking, not wanting to put on weight, experience of strong withdrawal symptoms, the smoking environment, and lack of knowledge about how to quit (Korhonen et al. 1997).

Smokers who enter the contest with a support person tend to be more successful than those who enter alone (Korhonen and Puska 2000). The presence of social support from friends, family, or coworkers contributes to quitting (Bains et al. 2000). Many studies have found that married smokers are more successful than single or divorced ones (Bains et al. 2000; Korhonen et al. 2000), and smokers who choose to enter the contest as a result of their own decision have higher quit rates than smokers who are entered into the contest by family or friends. Smokers who experience fewer withdrawal symptoms are more successful at quitting than those who experience strong symptoms (Korhonen et al. 1997).

**Participation rates**

While a recent review uncovered little evidence that Quit and Win contests increase long-term success rates among quitters, they do have a significant impact by increasing the number of people who make the initial attempt (Hey and Perera 2005). By enticing more people to attempt quitting in the first place, the overall number of successful quitters is increased. As such, one of the keys to a successful Quit and Win campaign is to maximize the number of contest entrants.

International campaigns are capable of recruiting hundreds of thousands of participants from many different countries. Quit and Win 1994 recruited 13 countries and 60,000 smokers, while 2004 saw 71 countries and 700,000 smokers participate. The total number of international Quit and Win contest participants over the 10-year period between 1994 and 2004 was 2.12 million (Quit and Win 2006). If the estimated average self-reported cessation rate was accurate, this would translate into 424,000 new nonsmokers. Or using the conservative 7% rate provided by Hahn et al. (2004), international Quit and Win contests would have motivated almost 150,000 people to successfully quit smoking worldwide. Had
these people been left to their own devices, the Hahn et al. (2004) figure of a 0.7% quit rate would suggest that only about 15,000 of those people would have successfully quit otherwise.

The total number of entrants should also be considered with respect to population size and percentage participation rates. The participation rate is the number of smokers who enroll out of the total targeted smoking population (Korhonen et al. 2000). On average, Quit and Win contests enroll anywhere between 0.04% and 7% of the local smoking population (Croghan et al. 2001). In the 1998 campaign, the highest national participation rate was found in Finland, with 1.7% of smokers entering the contest; the highest regional participation rate was an astonishing 20.1% in Puyang, China (Korhonen and Puska 2000; Korhonen et al. 2000). The approximately 200,000 smokers registered for the 1998 international campaign equaled more than 0.1% of all the smokers in the world (Korhonen and Puska 2000).

**Cost per participant/Cost per quitter**

Finally, when examining the success of the Quit and Win programs, the costs of the campaign should be carefully examined. Total costs vary widely, depending on the geographic area being covered, the size of the population being reached, and the relative cost of media airtime and space. For example, only $4,900 US was spent on the contest in San Diego in 1986 (Elder et al. 1991), whereas $649,264 US was spent in Sweden in 1988 (Tillgren et al. 1993). While these figures are somewhat out of date, they serve to demonstrate that total campaign costs may vary widely, but tell us little about campaign success. These figures reflect neither how many smokers participated in each of the campaigns nor how many successful quit attempts resulted from each of the contests.

To determine if the program is successful, the cost per participant and cost per quitter must be calculated. Cost per participant is the total cost of the campaign divided by the number of participants. Participation rates in North Karelia (Finland), for example, have been consistently higher than anywhere else. In 1986, 1989, 1994, 1996, and 1997 the rates have been 3.2%, 1.7%, 2%, 2%, and 3.2%, respectively (Korhonen et al. 1999). At first glance it would seem prudent to consider the key structural differences in their programs to attempt to mimic their success in other regions. However, their program has a large local budget ($20,000 US as compared with the separate budget of $110,000 US for the rest of Finland’s 1996 campaign and the median national budget of $5,000–10,000 US) and makes use of costly direct marketing techniques such as door-to-door distribution of registration forms (Korhonen et al. 1999).
cost per participant in this region was calculated at $50 US; nationally the average in Finland (including North Karelia) was $20 US, suggesting that while participation rates were high, their recruitment methods were less cost-effective than those employed throughout the rest of the country.

Cost per quitter is a vital consideration when developing contest best-practices. Unfortunately it takes significant resources to measure and evaluate campaigns, and few campaigns provide this figure. The cost per quitter is the total cost divided by the number of successful quitters (Tillgren et al. 1993). For example, the 1996 China contest was very cost-efficient, since a total of $36,690 US was spent with the cost per participant and quitter at $3 and $8, respectively. On the other hand, even though the total cost of $2,651 US for the 1990 Medicine Hat (Alberta, Canada) contest was less than the Chinese contest, the cost per participant and quitter of $35 and $165, respectively, were much higher; thus the Medicine Hat contest was far less cost-efficient (Leinweber, MacDonald, and Campbell 1994). A United States estimate suggests that the additional annual cost of medical care attributable to smoking-related illness is approximately $280 US per smoker (RITC 2003). Weighing even some of the highest contest costs against the additional potential costs related to continued smoking behavior, the contributions of Quit and Win contests are clear.

**Recommendations to Improve Quit and Win Programs**

While Quit and Win contests have been highly successful, can still improvements be considered. It is clear that the key to increased cessation is increased participation in quitting attempts. Therefore, to improve the effectiveness of Quit and Win contests, future campaigns should focus on recruiting as many participants as possible (Korhonen et al. 2000). The entire marketing mix should be focused on this task. To attract more participants, expanded promotional efforts, increased ease of entry, more enticing prizes, and increased smoking cessation support should be used.

The most important way to increase participation among individual smokers is to increase the number of organizing sponsors running contests around the world. The 2006 campaign’s target is 80 countries and 1 million smoking entrants (Quit and Win 2005). This is an increase of 9 countries and 300,000 participants over the 2004 contest. Large commercial, government, and nongovernment organizations in countries where Quit and Win contests have not been organized should be approached to participate. Sponsorship packages should be sent to as many prospective organizations as possible and then followed up with personal calls to gauge interest, answer questions, and encourage participation. Not only
do more programs equate to increased participation, but programs tend to attract more participation in their initial years, due to the novelty factor.

In first developing and introducing a Quit and Win contest, a mass media approach to gain awareness is important to the effectiveness of the campaign. Combining mass media approaches with the efforts of local grass-roots organizations is a cost-effective approach that can recruit three to six times more participants than mass media alone (Tillgren et al. 1995b). Combining mass media and community action may be a particularly effective way to improve efficiency. One example of community action that makes the contest more personal is using peer networks and organizations to recruit participants. Close and extensive collaboration with official and voluntary services in the community, widespread distribution of registration forms, and information circulating through many channels, such as mass media, role models, posters, and special Quit and Win events, can also be used to increase community awareness, support, participation, and success rates (Korhonen et al. 1999). Organizers must also increase the amount and breadth of local sponsorship support of the program, both to increase the donated financial and in-kind resources available to the contest and to broaden communication and distribution channels for the recruitment drive. Once smokers, their friends, or families become aware of the contest, they must have easy access to further contest information and entry. Entry forms and other promotional items should be widely distributed to maximize the likelihood that smokers will participate (Tillgren et al. 1992).

Effective promotion may be easier in communities in which contests are still new and therefore still newsworthy (Lando et al. 1995). Some contests suffer from wear-out with entry rates decreasing over time. This suggests that new potential smoker entrants are not being affected by successive campaign messages. Therefore, efforts should be made to refresh campaigns in some way every year. The addition of supporter programs and doctor/practitioner referral programs has helped this cause. However, different incentives should also be offered to the smokers themselves. Campaigns may specifically target smokers with the demographic characteristics most readily associated with cessation but should also consider ways to reach a wider range of smokers.

Local campaigns should attempt to take advantage of the benefits provided by the Internet. While penetration levels are low in some countries such as China where only 7.23% were Internet users in 2004, countries such as Canada boast some of the highest Internet penetration rates in the world with 62.36% of the country being Internet users in 2004 (United Nations 2006). In countries such as this where penetration rates are high, advertising campaigns have been used
extensively to draw interested parties to a centralized web site where they can fill in a contest entry online and gain online access to a wide variety of support resources for quitting (Hahn et al. 2005). The Quit and Win organization currently has a web site for disseminating information to interested campaign organizers, but it has offered nothing like a centralized contest entry option for smokers who do not have local programs running in their communities. This is another service that a web-based program could offer to expand the number of participants and quitters generated by the contest annually.

Quit and Win contests will not attract all the smokers in a community, only those who are ready to quit. Programs to move smokers to the preparation stage could be undertaken before the contest even begins (Lai et al. 2000). The campaign should encourage smokers who have not previously entered a contest, as well as previously unsuccessful entrants, to enter the contest (Korhonen et al. 1999). Quitters who live with continuing smokers are less likely to quit successfully, so recruitment should encourage the enrollment of all the smokers in a household (Leinweber et al. 1994). Because having support has proven to be a determinant for successful quitting, the Quit and Win contests should focus more on involving family and friends and to developing other support mechanisms for the participants. Also, providing cessation advice and pharmacological aids can further improve quit rates (Gomez-Zamudio et al. 2004). Public policies requiring smoke-free public spaces and workplaces can also contribute to a supportive environment that encourages quitting.

Future contests should also consider tailoring messages to fit the different phases of the program. A “you can do it” approach should be used for recruitment, while the actual cessation period should focus on teaching coping skills (Elder et al. 1991). Quit and Win contests should also focus on the successful stop smoking methods, such as quitting completely, rather than cutting down slowly, and by suggesting ways of coping with stress (Roberts et al. 1993). Publicity needs to be maintained throughout the duration of the contest to keep contestants motivated and to ensure that they return their quit forms at the end of the contest (Roberts et al. 1993).

If not prepared to quit by the specified quit day, smokers are not eligible to participate in the contest. To overcome this problem, some contests have been organized over extended periods of time, ranging from three to eight months, so that smokers are not disqualified if they fail to enter by the first deadline (McAllister et al. 2000). Smokers can specify their own quit date (Lando, Hellerstedt et al. 1991) and are free to enter the contest any time during the several month period. Almost two-thirds of the participants in the 1988 Minnesota contest entered after the first month, proving
that the extended contests are an efficient way to increase the participation rates (Lando, Hellerstedt et al. 1991). These programs have the potential to increase community interest and participation because they offer more promotion and publicity opportunities; however, they are extremely resource-intensive in terms of effort and expenditure.

The cost-effectiveness of the contest should also be examined more closely. Having a higher financial input for recruitment allows for more intensive campaigning and special activities to take place (Korhonen et al. 1999). However, increased expenditures should produce similarly increased results. Calculations of cost per participant and cost per quitter should be more rigorously measured. These figures should be compared with the costs of other smoking cessation methods available in the country, as well as the costs associated with continued smoking behavior. Campaigns should attempt to achieve continuity over time so that the cost of developing resource materials may be spread over multiple years to reduce the cost of the program over time. Table 1 provides a summary of best practices for Quit and Win contests.

Implications for Other Social Marketing Programs
Other social marketing campaigns can learn and benefit from studying the structure and success of Quit and Win programs. The four most important elements in a successful Quit and Win campaign appear to be the ability to:

- Offer a short-term incentive.
- Attract high participation rates.
- Measure behavior change.
- Have a cost per quitter than is lower than the average individual long-term cost of smoking.

Social marketing programs that can find ways to meet these criteria can be equally successful in modifying behavior.

The Quit and Win example has shown that a short-term incentive to change behavior can work. Many social marketing programs lack this short-term incentive; thus, the short-term rewards of undesirable behavior (such as unprotected sex or getting high) outweigh any possible short-term benefits gained by not behaving in that manner. However, it is clearly easier to offer contest incentives for some social marketing causes than for others. For example, it is unlikely that any short-term prize incentive will dissuade a heroine addict from injecting, while it could convince someone to take a taxi rather than drive home under the
influence of alcohol. The key to convincing people to forego undesirable behavior and enter the contest program is to offer an incentive interesting enough to gain widespread participation.

Not all types of social marketing campaigns could expect high contest participation rates. Campaigns trying to change socially deviant or illegal behavior such as problem gambling, alcoholism, or drug dependency would not attract many participants to a contest due to the desire for anonymity. Instead, contest incentive programs should be more effective for programs encouraging positive behavior or

TABLE 1

Best Practices for Quit and Win Contests

1. Maximize number of participants who are recruited through extensive media efforts, ease of entry, enticing prizes, and increased smoking cessation support.

2. Increase number of organizing sponsors running contests around the world to increase number of countries and jurisdictions represented.

3. Encourage large commercial, government, and nongovernment organizations to participate.

4. Combine mass media approaches with the efforts of local grass-roots organizations to create a cost-effective approach that maximizes recruitment.

5. Increase local sponsorship support to ensure greater financial and in-kind donations, as well as to broaden communication and distribution channels for the recruitment drive.

6. Refresh the campaign every year using new ideas and methods.

7. Use the Internet to extend campaign reach and effectiveness.

8. Undertake programs to move smokers to the “preparation” stage before the contest begins.

9. Encourage enrollment of all the smokers in a household.

10. Involve family and friends and develop support mechanisms for the participants.

11. Tailor messages to fit different phases of the program [e.g., “you can do it” approach for recruitment; teaching coping skills during the cessation period].

12. Maintain publicity throughout the contest to keep contestants motivated and ensure return of quit forms at the end of the contest.

13. Organize contests over extended periods of time so that smokers are not disqualified if they fail to enter by the first deadline.

14. Cost per participant and cost per quitter should be measured and tracked over time.

15. Maintain campaign continuity over time to amortize cost of developing resource materials over time.
changing negative but still relatively socially acceptable behavior. Some examples of appropriate campaigns could include offering contest entry to men who get annual physicals or women who abstain from drinking alcohol while pregnant.

For high participation to yield high rates of behavioral change, entrants must know that their behavior can be monitored. It is also much easier to monitor behavior change in some instances than others. For instance, weight loss is easily measured, whereas whether someone has had unprotected sex or consumed alcohol in the past month are not. Thus, the ideal candidates for contest incentive programs are limited by behavioral measurability corresponding to participant accountability. Two such social causes could be weight loss and skin cancer prevention programs. Whether someone has been sun tanning is easily monitored through skin pigmentation changes and checking tan lines. Weight loss is inexpensively measured via a scale, and there are clear examples of potential prizes working as a weight loss incentive, such as through the reality television show *The Biggest Loser*. Obviously, such television programs have low participation and incredibly high costs, but the idea is easily adapted to larger audiences, as attempted by Dr. Phil McGraw on his popular television series during his 2003–2004 Ultimate Weight Loss Challenge.

Social issues with very low public health costs may not be appropriate choices for prize incentive programs. However, using low-cost marketing and recruitment methods such as public relations, publicity, and sponsorship to promote and implement a contest program helps to ensure that the costs of eliciting behavior change are low. Thus, the opportunity for a prize program to outweigh the costs of the status quo is increased, as are the number of social issues that can be addressed by such programs. The possibility of implementing such a program should be explored by any social marketing organization that can entice a wide audience with a short-term incentive that is more appealing than the current behaviour, can easily measure if behavior change has occurred, and can do so at a low cost per participant.

Quit and Win results indicate that incentive programs work to provide short-term incentives for behavioral change where long-term personal benefits do not. However, as previously indicated, behavior can be difficult to monitor for the purposes of prize distribution. Thus, it may be useful to look beyond contests to other possible types of promotional incentives to achieve behavioral change. Free gifts with purchase or premiums are one type of incentive to stimulate change in social marketing contexts where behavior is more difficult to monitor. For example, as part of its recent healthy food initiative, Disney partnered with grocery chain Kroger by cobranding over 100 of their healthy food items to make
healthy foods more appealing to children (Reyes 2006). The use of Disney characters as an incentive to buy healthy foods could be taken one step further by offering small toys as premiums with healthy food products in the same way that they used to be offered in boxes of sugary cereals.

Another social concern that is difficult to monitor is increased physical activity. A short-term incentive for this behavior could be to offer such items as sporting equipment like running shoes or outdoor jackets as trade-ins for video game consoles or personal video recorders. Alternatively, short-term discounting incentives such as cash back on one’s monthly membership fee could be provided to gym members who work out at least three times per week for an entire month as a way to reward regular exercise. AIDS awareness programs could encourage condom purchasers to mail in three or more proofs of purchase in exchange for a free gift such as a personal massager. Any sort of short-term incentive that may help to motivate some sort of positive change in behavior should be considered as a viable option to help achieve social marketing goals.

Conclusion
There is convincing evidence from a wide variety of studies that Quit and Win contests help to increase smoking cessation. It is estimated that Quit and Win contests have helped hundreds of thousands of smokers to quit worldwide, changing their behavior, future health, and quality of life for the better. While these social marketing campaigns take large amounts of human and financial resources to administer, the outcomes to date have been extremely worthwhile. It is important to note, however, that while Quit and Win contests are already successful, there is always room for improvement. To increase smoking cessation around the world, even stronger efforts are needed to convince more organizing sponsors to manage Quit and Win campaigns, to motivate more smokers to want to quit, to encourage more smokers to enter the contest, and to increase support to smokers throughout the campaign. In this way, global smoking rates can be reduced through a highly effective and well-coordinated social marketing campaign.

About the Authors
Anne M. Lavack, Ph.D., is professor and associate dean, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada. Her research focuses on tobacco marketing and “de-marketing.”

Lisa Watson, Ph.D., is assistant professor of marketing, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada. Her
research interests lie in the area of emotions and their influence on consumer behavior.

**Julie Markwart, B.B.A.,** is an alumnus of the Faculty of Business Administration at the University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada.

**Acknowledgments**
This research is supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and Canadian Tobacco Control Research Initiative (CTCRI) with funds from the Canadian Cancer Society, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, National Cancer Institute of Canada, and Health Canada. The authors thank Research Assistants Heather Brothen and Shelley Carlson.

**References**


