

In this issue:

- \* New report – The 12 Values Modes (Part Two)
- \* Why Heuristics Work And Why Campaigns Need A Psychological Makeover
- \* Mainstreaming Change

### **The 12 Values Modes: Part Two – The Prospectors**

With the last newsletter we published the first section our three part guide to the detailed Values Modes which make up the three big motivational segments of the Cultural Dynamics (<http://www.cultdyn.co.uk>) model of unconscious values. That was on the Settlers, or the Security /Sustenance Driven people and is at <http://bit.ly/y8z9Oh>

This month we publish the second part – a guide to the Values Modes that make up the Prospectors. The Golden Dreamers, the Happy Followers, the Now People, and the Tomorrow People. You can read or download it at:

[http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/12vm\\_2\\_prospectors.pdf](http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/12vm_2_prospectors.pdf)

There are many reports and studies using the model and applying it to campaigns and communications elsewhere at [www.campaignstrategy.org](http://www.campaignstrategy.org). Newsletter 77 (<http://bit.ly/yiAb9k>) linked to some Guidelines on Communicating with the three big Maslow Groups, Settlers, Prospectors and Pioneers. You can read a lot more about these three groups and their dynamics are described in *What Makes People Tick: The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors, and Pioneers* (<http://bit.ly/nuNWK8>).

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Why Heuristics Work And Why Campaigns Need A Psychological Makeover**

Heuristics are rules of thumb about how communications generally work. They've been discussed in several previous Newsletters (eg <http://bit.ly/ciJG2L>, <http://bit.ly/KD4INW>, <http://bit.ly/lkMnBu>) and an entire section is devoted to them in my book *How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change* (<http://amzn.to/JDWpi7>).

One of the most influential heuristics researchers is psychologist and economist Daniel Kahneman. With Amos Tversky, he proposed that when faced with hard-to-make decisions, people tend to unconsciously substitute an easy decision for a harder one. Making an analytical choice requires consciously processing facts and information, and applying tests of logic, and is hard work. So, and especially in conditions of time pressure and high uncertainty, we tend to opt for reflexive thinking, also known as 'emotional' or unconscious decision-making. These easier, more comfortable short-cuts are heuristics.

For example, I might be asked to chose between two political policies on a subject I know little about. Finding this inconvenient, I plump for the messenger I like best (Liking Heuristic). She or he might be more attractive or come from a party I like or may have been recommended by a friend. So I just (unconsciously) substituted making an analytical reflective decision about the policy with a reflexive emotional one about the messenger. Which is why making politicians (or anyone else) appear more attractive, or picking more attractive candidates to field in an election, increases their share of the vote.

Anyone who followed my advice on twitter to read *Thinking Fast and Slow*, by, Daniel Kahneman (Allen Lane, 2011) will have discovered two things.

First that it is quite hard going. It's probably one of those books lots of people buy but not many actually read. (And another heuristic effect is that if you make a statement harder to read, people are less likely to believe it – for example by making the characters less legible). But it's a best-seller and he got a Nobel Prize so it looks good on the bookshelf.

Second, that rather than referring to an easy to remember difference between the two ways of thinking, like 'reflective' and 'reflexive' (tap your knee and it jumps: a reflex, ask yourself why this happens and you start to analyse it – reflection), Kahneman refers to them as System 1 and System 2. Now it's harder to remember which is which ! Presumably this is because his distinction is not quite the same as reflexive and reflective but for our purposes they are essentially similar as System 1 is unconscious and System 2 is conscious. Kahneman also calls them automatic and intuitive (#1), and effortful (#2).

### **Laziness**

If you are feeling lazy, you can get a good idea of what it's all about by reading the online reviews of Kahneman's book, although come to think of it, that's probably another heuristic. A journalist or reviewer has to get to 'the point' in a few hundred words so they may well be telling you the 'key points' that you need. Or, you can read the less feted Robert Cialdini, and his readable *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*, (Collins, 1984), and for more of reflexive and reflective, George Lakoff's *The Political Mind* (Penguin, 2009).

Anyway, the crucial thing to remember in constructing campaign strategies is that try as you might, you are not going to be able to get most people to use the effortful, reflective type of thinking to respond to your campaign. Instead they will, if they pay any attention at all, use the intuitive, unconscious (System 1) reflexive thinking to determine whether you are right or wrong, or your offer or ask makes sense. This also applies to how they process what everyone else says to them: your opponents, commentators, their friends or colleagues who offer any sort of opinion or 'facts', the media and so on.

As a consultant and trainer I find its quite easy to get people to accept this by showing them examples. Consistency (holding opinions or attitudes matched to your behaviours so that they make sense), Social Proof (doing what others do), Liking, and Availability (a bias to judge things as more likely to happen based on how easy it is to recall a previous instance), Exchange (you did something for me so I become more likely to do something for you) are some of those more obviously relevant to public campaigns. But getting them to design communications strategies that use these heuristics is much more difficult. This is particularly the case with people who have been trained in reflective thinking, which of course is what most academic and professional training does. We tend to continue what we were doing, rather than change (Commitment Heuristic).

Many campaign groups accept the idea that it is important to have "pictures". *How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change* devotes several sections to thinking in pictures (try story-boarding your campaign and make it happen like that), visual language (communicating meaning without words) and the processes of seeing is believing. Many of the more successful campaigns make cost effective use of visual media like Youtube. Yet a

lot make the mistake of trying to use 'visuals' as a 'stunt' or 'calling card' added to a campaign where it is assumed the main communications will be through argument and words, and devote more time and effort to getting the words 'right' than the visuals.

### **WYSIATI**

Kahneman supplies a useful acronym to remind us why this tends to fail: WYSIATI, or What You See Is All There Is. Kahneman explains that the intuitive, emotional, reflexive form of decision making simply does not take account of information which is not immediately retrieved by the brain, which usually means, what is presented to you.

Because we have a strong, innate desire to find meaning, to assign causes, this can easily lead us to wrong conclusions, for example as witnesses. We see two men running and know later that a crime was committed and one was killed. We convince ourselves we saw one man chasing the other. And perhaps that he was 'the killer'. We take no account of facts we did not have available.

We see rain and rivers over-flowing but we do not see the state of groundwater (a topical example from the UK which has floods droughts in the middle of a drought) so we see there is no drought. We see bats roosting in a dying tree and are asked "what's killing the trees?" the obvious answer is "the bats are", even though it is analytically stupid.

Kahneman calls intuitive emotional reasoning "a machine for jumping to conclusions". Our innate desire for coherence, for instantly making things make sense, frequently leads us to make mistakes. That's a big problem when you need people to be analytical but in public campaigns you don't often have that opportunity, so instead you must make sure that the cues and signals you can send, will enable people to draw the right conclusions, even when using reflexive, unconscious reasoning.

A very simple example is holding a protest or a rally. Unless you actively want to look like a minority (which means, intuitively, most people not neither similar to you (Similarity) nor agreement in with you (Social un-Proof)), it is important that any image taken of said event fills the frame with people. Then it says, unconsciously, that this is a shared, majority concern. An exception discussed is 'David and Goliath'. Here the mind pattern-matches to an existing frame which plays to the advantage of David, who took on and slayed the giant, and the ideal number of Davids in the image becomes just one.

So much is now known about heuristics, and values and other influences on our unconscious that it is time all important social-cause campaigns got a thorough overhaul in their construction. Most campaigns, especially those run by older NGOs and public bodies, are in need of a psychological makeover.

### **A Makeover For 'Climate'**

As someone who has experienced despair at the sight of scientists (I was once one myself) and ethically-minded campaigners trying and failing to engage politicians and public to overcome vested interests in the decades-long saga of 'climate change', I personally would welcome it if those in charge of the international climate negotiations, the scientific advice processes, and the associated 'civil society' campaigns, would commission such a

makeover. It's the architecture and choreography and the visuals and stories they create that need changing, not just the words.

This means people like the GCCA and its big NGO members, the funders such as Pew, Oak, and Packard, other major players such as the European Climate Foundation and the inter-governmental bodies IPCC, the UNFCCC and the more progressive governments: they need to give their climate communications processes a psychological makeover.

They need to tap the expertise of the likes of Daniel Kahneman, Robert Cialdini and George Lakoff on the job, or Pat Dade at CDSM or Dan Gardner whose *Future Babble* explains how people's preferences for certainty over doubt lead them to avoid or ignore uncertainty, and to prefer definitive forecasters, even when they are repeatedly wrong (a Confidence Heuristic).

Since the Copenhagen climate talks fiasco, which is a rich hunting ground for students of heuristics, much progress has been made in many countries in swinging public opinion towards accepting changes to energy economies and indeed, the 'reality' of climate change. Mainly by not talking about uncertainties of climate science but by showing the benefits of things like renewable or 'clean' energy. To the point indeed, where 75% of Americans want to regulate CO2 as a pollutant, 76% back tax breaks for electric cars or solar pv and 79% support research into renewable energy (and 58% oppose new nuclear plants), and, the Democrats perceive it as a 'wedge issue' – a slim majority of Republican voters, unlike their Party apparatchiks, thing global warming itself should be a 'priority for President and Congress' (<http://tiny.cc/c42mdw>). Yet far greater and more rapid action is still required.

Such social communications are of vital public interest and the knowledge that could make them work is out there: it exists. Sadly it is still mostly the opposition who are using it. Maybe understanding how people really think and make decisions should be a test of competence for politicians, public communicators and leaders of NGOs to hold office.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Mainstreaming Change**

Almost by definition, most campaigns are trying to bring about change. At some point, most campaigns want their change to become 'mainstream', whether by spreading socially by choice through fashion, networks, norms or other means person to person or group to group, or by rules set by authority.

When something 'enters the mainstream', the need for a campaign usually stops. Campaigners may of course want to 'go further' so that requires a new campaign. Campaigners may not see it as 'new' but as a natural logical consequence. However targets, onlookers and supporters probably will do, because the specific change objective in the proposition [1] will have been achieved. Even 'stop' campaigns are often trying to stop and change an established behaviour, and so if that means a departure from what's seen as 'normal', that's a form of innovation too.

A useful rule of thumb is that if you want to carry something into the mainstream you need a mainstream messenger but more than that, you also tend to need mainstream channels and

contexts (see CAMPCAT – [2]). That means that you usually need to create a sense that this is no longer a contentious, marginal, fringe idea.

So what exactly *is* 'the mainstream' ? It is probably not something that most campaign groups think much about but it is something we are all conscious of: we have a sense of what is mainstream and what is not, an impression, a feeling; and social commentators, journalists and marketers will 'know it when we they it'.

To enter the mainstream, something:

- leaves the world of Innovators and Experimenters and is taken up by the Early Adopters (ie it can be defined by different behavioural segments).

- ceases to be generally contended and disputed as an 'issue', and is more agreed upon than disagreed about (ie can be defined in terms of attitude/ perception).

- is not the point where *everyone* is doing it or it has become completely normal but where that *begins* to happen, and where it still looks like 'change' (ie can be defined in terms of what it is remembered as).

- is often (in industrial societies) the point where something goes from DIY or improvisation to commodification and brands (ie defined by who does it and how)

New things spread through people changing a behaviour: they might for instance buy something different, spend their free time differently, dress differently, vote differently, pay attention to different things, or voice different opinions. The CDSM values model mentioned in the first article in this Newsletter helps make sense of how and why such 'mainstreaming' occurs.

### **Values, Behaviour and Mainstreaming**

There are two big 'tipping points' in the spread of new things [3]: one from Pioneers to Prospectors (emulation), which is the threshold of entering the mainstream, and one from Prospectors to Pioneers (normalisation, the completing of the process).

To recap in terms of values groups:

Fundamentally the Settlers have a low sense of self-agency. They tend to feel the world changes them, and that they cannot easily change the world. They are the least likely to join any call for change, and their default assumption is that change is probably a bad thing. The only type of campaign they are likely to be really happy with, is a stop-change campaign against some sort of innovation, or against a threat to belonging, or to identity. An invasion would be a classic example. Many social campaigns strongly supported by Settlers are framed in this way, for example as opposing a threat to "our way of life".

Prospectors become Prospectors by satisfying the needs for safety, security, identity and belonging which were dominant drivers while they were Settlers. They too start off with a low sense of self-agency, although less than that of the Settlers but they now have a burning sense of possibility. To Golden Dreamers anything is possible but they are not sure how to get it. If they begin to gain esteem of others, their social confidence grows, and by the time

they are Now People, beginning to seek self-esteem, they have a somewhat higher sense of self-agency, though nothing like that of the third big group, the Pioneers. This means that Now People are usually more likely to join a campaign for change than the Golden Dreamers, although both are Prospectors.

Having achieved self-esteem, the Pioneers have quite different dominant needs, not to do with safety or what others may think of them but more about self-direction, self-exploration, ethics, innovation, experiment and bringing everything together and finding new connections. Not being restrained by the social conservatism of Settlers, or the need to avoid failure which is stronger in Prospectors, the Pioneers are those most free to experiment, and tend to see change, especially innovative or 'ethical' change, as potentially 'interesting' or a good thing.

So the Pioneers are the natural base for most campaigns and tend to be very over-represented in the membership of campaign groups. This makes it relatively easy for Pioneer-led and framed initiatives to attract other people like them. By a process of self-selection, they then become the networks who are mobilised and organised. That may in itself be enough to win some campaigns, though often it is not.

In a highly developed country where social conditions have allowed a lot of people to meet the needs for safety or esteem, Pioneers may form a large part of the population (eg in the UK 41%, higher in some European countries). But in most countries, towns or cities or communities they are a minority. In China for example they are less than 20% of the population. Obviously this means campaigns usually need to somehow appeal to Settlers and Prospectors, if they are to achieve society-wide or any significant change. There are numerous examples of where this has not been achieved, sometimes because some Pioneers want to argue with, rather than to work with the values of other people.

That aside, another consequence of these values differences is that 'mainstreaming' of any innovation requires it to escape from Pioneer World, where it will have started, and spread to the Prospectors, before eventually reaching the Settlers. The way this happens is not usually Prospectors and Settlers joining 'campaigns' but by acting in other ways, so campaign groups may not even notice this is happening. Some may even try to stop it because the desired new behaviour is being done for what they see as the "wrong reasons".

A good example of change entering the mainstream (ie beyond Pioneer World) can now be seen in the UK in the case of 'greener' domestic lifestyles and homes.

### **Mainstreaming: The New 'Ideal Home'**

It would be hard to find a more "mainstream" British publication than *Ideal Home* magazine [4]. With a circulation of over one million, *Ideal Home* was launched in the 1920s as a promoter of middle class ideals about homes, houses and interior décor. Each issue includes extensive example of "makeovers", especially for new kitchens and bathrooms.

The May 2012 issue of *Ideal Home* features "675 ideas for every room" and is brimming with ideas to 'go green'. Yet this is no 'green' magazine, it is simply that 'green' has migrated from the world of campaign statements into fashion statement, from Pioneer World into Prospector World. So (in the UK) it is now 'mainstream'.

*Ideal Home* magazine does not start from an analysis of why it is 'good' to be green, it does not detail the toxic content of many chemically treated modern home fabrics and materials, or start by explaining the down sides of embedded carbon or climate change, in order to say it is better to buy "refashioned", "pre-used", "upcycled" or "second-hand" goods rather than new ones. It takes all that for granted and jumps straight to the look, the style, the stuff. Nor does it explain to readers the "waste hierarchy [5]": re-use is better than recycle for example. It goes straight to the action and sells it on the benefits – which are first and foremost social.

Visit one of *Ideal Home's* websites (eg <http://bit.ly/lkFKTq>) and you can discover what this currently means in Britain – the styles of 'vintage' and 'eco-chic' and 'shabby-chic' and a host of other sub-species. 'Vintage' requires re-use, and over the last decade, it has spread from a niche trend for embellishing clothes with mostly old fabrics, boosted by 'campaigns' that didn't look at all like campaigns such as 'Swishing' set up in 2000 by Lucy Shea of Futerra [6], reinforced by groups like Global Cool [7] and endorsed by various fashion models, into wholesale household design.

The contents list of the 210 page May *Ideal Home* promises: (p 72) "Give Your Home an Eco Makeover"; "Take the Affordable Eco-option" (p 32); "Dress Your Home with Vintage Treasures"; "Mix the Old with the New" (p 22); "Give Old Objects a New Lease of Life" (p 50); "Our Recycled Workshops Make it Special" (p 120); "Our Room Proves Eco can be Glam" (p 128) and (p 132), the road-to-Damascus story of "Salvaging Our Bath Was The Starting Point" (p 132), and there are lots more.

I've written before in this Newsletter [8] about Swishing as an example of a behaviour moving from Pioneer World to Prospector World. In July 2009 as the recession began to bite, *Resolving Koo's Paradox: A Non-Profit Opportunity ?* suggested [9] that the emerging fashion for re-use and embellishment could combine with a desire to spend less, in a 'new thrift' economy. Here's an extract:

*Richard C Koo is Chief Economist at the Nomura Research Institute [see box]. 'Koo's Paradox' is that during times of a 'balance sheet recession', saving becomes a vice rather than a virtue. This is because in such a recession, the behavioural driver for companies, banks and individuals becomes debt minimisation rather than profit maximisation until they repair their balance sheets.*

*With the psychology of the market thrown into reverse, the normal rules and mechanisms of economics do not apply, argues Koo. In these circumstances unless governments borrow and spend until lenders and borrowers have repaired their balance sheets, a recession may slide into a depression. If individuals respond by saving when they could be spending, this only spurs the spiral of economic decline ...*

*... In these abnormal times, could we be on the cusp of just such a tipping point but one where the 'new behaviour' for Outer Directed [Prospectors] is already accepted by Settlers ? If you like, a pincer movement. The significance of this would be that the behaviour spreads across all values groups. The behaviour in question is thrift, and the resolution of Koo's paradox could be a path out of recession based not on a return to 'business as usual' in terms of mass material consumption but on re-use and consuming less, at least less in terms of material goods or the materials in goods and services.*

In a country with a values spread like that of the UK, if something widespread amongst Pioneers (41%) becomes 'mainstreamed' by also being picked up by Prospectors (29%), it begins to look 'normal'. Settlers are then also attracted to it in order to 'be normal'. In the case of thriftiness, Settlers may already be warm to the idea for their own reasons.

At any event, as the *Ideal Home* of May 2012 amply illustrates, the way Prospectors do this is to better and best it, to maximise it. So 'vintage' or second hand becomes an obvious fashion. The key to mainstreaming purchase of second hand goods has been the Prospector trick of making thrift look like acquisitiveness: to make it literally, acquisitive, displayable, esteem-able. "Fashion", a purely perceptual, insubstantial, immaterial source of value, transforms an old household object or garment from 'junk' of low value, into a must-have with high value. In recycling-world speak this is the difference between downcycling 'waste' into raw materials and upcycling it into objects of aspiration.

How significant the trend for re-use and vintage clothing and purchase of second-hand goods is for the general economy in Britain is hard to say but it is certainly growing. Sales in Oxfam Shops [10], which sell donated second hand goods, were up 11% in the UK last year. In April 2012 the very mainstream *Daily Mail* reported that such charities are now opening what it called 'superstores', saying [11]:

*"The 'squeezed middle' is fuelling a boom in charity shops as families are forced off the high street to buy second-hand clothes and furniture.*

*The demand has prompted one charity to open three out-of-town superstores as customers clamour for used stock such as clothes, electrical goods, sofas and beds.*

*The Sue Ryder organisation, which provides palliative care in communities, has opened a 2,965sq ft store in King's Lynn which took more than £2,100 on its first day of trading"*

If bought on price alone, second-hand goods are obviously in direct competition with cheap new goods, such as clothes produced in 'sweat shop' conditions in low-labour-cost countries and sold in supermarkets but that does not apply to 'vintage', as promoted by *Ideal Home* and others. Of course there is a problem: depending on your definition (about which debate rages [12]), there is a limited supply of 'original' and 'vintage' items. So demand has led to emulation of the style, even if the items are new. An advertisement feature in *Ideal Home* gives this very Prospector tip: "Try new, for old. Look out for reproduction vintage – it's easier and cheaper than scouring shops for originals ...". Or get the look, never mind the content. These are also known as 're-imagined' goods.

There are dozens of online 'vintage retailers' (eg [www.rokit.co.uk](http://www.rokit.co.uk)), and plenty of scope for ingenuity in extending the trend. For instance the moveable gap between past and present for "retro", which involves the resurrection of any past era of fashion, means that much larger volumes of 'stuff' may get re-used, from say the 1970s or 1980s, compared to a definition pegged to things from the 1950s or earlier.

This is not just happening in the UK. The attention-markets of the Pioneers and Now People Prospectors are international if not global. A contributor to the crowd sourced [www.trendhunter.com](http://www.trendhunter.com) noted in 2011:

*'Upcycling and Re-Styling are the New Organic When It Comes to Style: Barneys New York is doing it, Yves St. Laurent is doing it - just like Urban Outfitters or The Green Vixen. Call it re-styled, up-cycled or refashioned clothing: all these hot fashion designers turn pre-loved clothing into one-of-a-kind eco-fashion outfits.*

*The advantages are clear: It is the ultimate in eco-friendly as it re-uses materials and creates no production waste. And then - it's truly unique: no other celeb is going to sport the same dress. Ever.*

### **Do Campaigners Plan For Mainstreaming ?**

In instrumental terms, in Britain it is notable that the campaigning NGO which has done most to catalyse this trend with its 'environmental' benefits, has been Oxfam [13], a development-aid and poverty relief organisation. Although active on issues such as sweat-shop labour, Oxfam started its shops less to change behaviours in consumption and far more, simply to raise funds by selling clothes, books and other goods donated by sympathisers.

Indeed with the exception of the likes of Futerra and Global Cool, campaign groups intent on changing 'consumption' seem to have played little if any part in the process. For those opposed to 'consumption's it almost as if the phenomenon does not exist. Perhaps that's because in terms of its motivation, it is largely indistinguishable from other types of consumption, and some are dogmatically opposed to 'consumption'. Could this mindset actually be limiting the effectiveness of campaigns ?

### **Articles of Faith**

In my view the danger for campaigners and advocates drawing up strategies to achieve change is their articles of faith. This may lead them not to see positive things happening, partly because they assume it can't exist in the terms it does, and partly because they go looking for signs of the opposite.

Doctrinaire assumptions are not confined to NGOs. For example the assumption that "we live in a throw-away society" with waste increasing every year helped lead UK central and local government to under-estimate the public will to recycle [14].

In 2011 IPSOS-Mori in partnership with Dr Agnes Nairn produced a report for UNICEF entitled *Children's Well-being in UK, Sweden and Spain: The Role of Inequality and Materialism* [15]. Although based on relatively tiny samples in a qualitative study, the report has several odd features it made some pretty sweeping assertions about 'culture' in different countries, and laid into the 'materialist' and 'consumerist' UK, which it contrasted approvingly with the 'culture' in countries like Spain and Sweden. According to UNICEF it showed UK children were caught in a 'materialist trap'.

The authors wrote:

*'Whilst Swedish parents did admit to buying branded goods for their children, this was generally due to a perception of higher quality and durability of these items (especially, for example in winter and outdoor clothing) rather than their 'status value'. Other Swedish parents noted that they were happy to buy second hand things, which was not something we heard about from parents or children in the UK, apart from one mother who chose to buy from charity shops as a lifestyle choice relating to reducing environmental pressures by over consumption.'*

The use of terms like 'trap' and 'culture' suggest a pervasive and pretty fixed force influencing people according to the country they live in. Yet although the research was conducted in 2009-2010 there is no reference to the growing trend for re-fashioning, upcycling, second hand goods, vintage, re-styling etc., even though it was one of the major consumer changes of the time, and quite obviously changing the practical nature of 'materialism', not least in terms of what counts as a symbol of status. Perhaps it simply did not fit with the starting assumptions of the study.

[1] see RASPB propositions in Chris Rose, *How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change*, Earthscan 2010, pp 175-6

[2] CAMPCAT – see Chris Rose, *How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change*, Earthscan 2010, pp 25 – 6

[3] see for example [http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/resolving\\_koo.pdf](http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/resolving_koo.pdf)

[4] <http://www.idealhome.magazine.co.uk> and <http://www.housetohome.co.uk/>

[5] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste\\_hierarchy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste_hierarchy)

[6] [http://swishing.com/about\\_swishing/](http://swishing.com/about_swishing/)

[7] <http://www.globalcool.org/tag/art-of-swishing>

[8] Eg <http://bit.ly/ciJG2L>, <http://bit.ly/uf0aB7>, <http://bit.ly/94qTgS>

[9] [http://www.campaignstrategy.org/newsletters/campaignstrategy\\_newsletter\\_53.pdf](http://www.campaignstrategy.org/newsletters/campaignstrategy_newsletter_53.pdf);  
[http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/resolving\\_koo.pdf](http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/resolving_koo.pdf)

[10] Oxfam [www.oxfam.org](http://www.oxfam.org) is a UK-based charity which partly funds its work through donated second hand items sold to the public in its shops; <http://bit.ly/AlbBRJ>

[11] <http://bit.ly/lxV2zv>

[12] <http://m.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-17667524>

[13] Oxfam has a vintage marketing section online and many of its groups engage with local swishing events

[14] <http://bit.ly/ciJG2L>

[15] <http://bit.ly/oE9gwN>

The Campaign Strategy Newsletter - Copyright Chris Rose. You are free to reproduce all or any part of this newsletter if you credit the source. <http://www.campaignstrategy.org> is a non-profit website on campaign techniques & strategies, designed to help NGOs. To subscribe to this free newsletter visit <http://www.campaignstrategy.org>.

To offer contributions or comments contact the author [chris.rose@campaignstrategy.org](mailto:chris.rose@campaignstrategy.org)

By Chris Rose:

*How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change*, (edn 2) Earthscan 2010, from <http://amzn.to/JDWpi7>

*What Makes People Tick: The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors, and Pioneers*, Troubador (2011) from <http://bit.ly/nuNWK8>