



Critical vision in a challenged world

Gerard Hastings, Roger Sugden and Mark Grindle

Stirling Institute for Socio-management, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

Abstract

Purpose – The financial crisis demands that we in the business academy raise our game: we either caused it by training the generation of “greed is good” MBAs who designed those financial instruments of mass destruction, or failed to prevent it by not equipping them with appropriate caution and ethical standards. In short, we are either complicit or irrelevant. The purpose of this paper is to discuss how Michael Thomas anticipated both the causes and the lessons of the financial crisis, and made a robust call for change long before this became a mainstream concern.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper discusses the work and ideas of Michael Thomas in the context of the current financial crisis.

Findings – The paper concludes that we can respond to Michael Thomas’ vision with a combination of muscular game keeping and intelligent poaching.

Practical implications – Michael Thomas’s thinking has profound implications not just for marketing but the whole business sector. The newly established Stirling Institute for Socio-Management (SISM) is responding to his call to look critically at current business models and completely reengineer our processes and procedures. SISM also argues that lessons learnt about influencing consumer behaviour can be applied to other parts of life such as social and health behaviours.

Originality/value – The paper highlights Michael Thomas’s notions of a new, “social capitalism” founded on trust and transparency.

Keywords Social capitalism, Economic conditions, Marketing

Paper type Viewpoint

Honesty and optimism

Michael Thomas foretold it, the credit crunch confirmed it, and the sweeping cuts we are now facing will make sure we all (though mostly the poor) feel its pain. I am talking about the downside of corporate capitalism – or to use Michael Thomas’ epithet, the “monster that no one can control” (Thomas, 1999). The unthinking search for perpetual growth and ever more profit is as dangerous as it is unrealistic. And we academic marketers should take note and breathe our *mea culpas* for, even if we are not in the “cockpit of capitalism” (Thomas, 1999), we are training the pilots and consulting for their bosses. As *The Economist* observed just a few months ago, in considering the evidence on our performance offered by the recent and ongoing economic crisis: “this has been a year of sackcloth and ashes for the world’s business schools” (Schumpeter, 2009).

There is, as *The Economist* went on to say, and the *British Journal of Management* (*BJM*) (Currie *et al.*, 2010) underlined, a need for reinvention in our business schools; for a greater degree of “scepticism and cynicism” and a much more critical look at capitalism and the uses it makes of our pedagogy. Not critical in the academic and rather narrow sense, it has often come to mean – paying homage to Bourdieu and Derrida – but in the muscular sense Michael Thomas intended. There is something rotten in the state of capitalism and it is our job to do (or at least research, teach and explain) something about it. Furthermore, as the *BJM* emphasises, we have to offer sensible ways forward:



deconstruction may make good box office, but without a blueprint for reconstruction it will never change the world.

And here, as Michael Thomas well understood, marketing ideas present a chink of light. Specifically, they have much to say about people – understanding them, meeting their needs and empowering them. Yes this liberal intent gets co-opted to meet corporate goals, and can mutate into a neo-liberal agenda, but it also generates wealth and offers a tool box for harnessing that wealth to the good of communities and societies. As the political rhetoric focuses on community activism and the Big Society, and co-production becomes the watch-word of the social as well as the commercial sector, marketing has some real value to offer.

The Stirling Institute for Socio-Management (SISM) recognises these twin benefits of critical thought: honesty about the evident failings of extant business practice; optimism about the potential of business ideas to address societies' problems and opportunities. Its aim is to question current assumptions and models, and explore new approaches – embracing Michael Thomas' notions of a new, "social capitalism" founded on trust and transparency.

The man who foretold the past

We have unleashed a monster that no one can control, even that minority that profits from it. Unashamed self-interest is a vice, not a virtue. We must recognise that the usefulness of an activity is not necessarily measured by its profitability, and that what someone earns is not an indicator of their talents and abilities, still less of their moral stature (Thomas, 1999).

Thus, did Michael Thomas foretell the credit crunch a decade before it struck. But, because the prophet and historian are inextricably linked, he also took us back to our roots, to the very origins of marketing thought. An extensive review of the field in the *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* (Wilkie and Moore, 2003), points out that what the authors call "marketing and society" has been a key part of marketing since it first became a distinct discipline at the turn of the twentieth century. They go on to note that well before the Second World War marketers were not limiting themselves to studying narrow managerial issues, but were addressing much wider social questions such as whether advertising is desirable or certain industries should exist at all (see Marketing and society). Given the recent depredations of sub-prime mortgages, their idea that credit availability is a "nonessential" service which should be eliminated is particularly sobering. More generally, they were interested in how the relationship between consumers, marketers and Government could "facilitate the maximal operations of the system for the benefit of the host society" (Wilkie and Moore, 2003, p. 118).

Marketing and society

Wider social Issues have always been a concern of marketing thought, as Wilkie and Moore's summary of the broader questions early marketers were addressing shows:

- Are there too many middlemen? Does distribution cost too much?
- Does advertising raise or lower prices?
- What control, if any, should be exerted over new combinations in distribution?

- Of the total costs paid by consumers, which elements are desirable? Indispensable?
- What about “nonessential” services such as credit availability; should these be eliminated?

Interestingly, this societal focus was developing and being championed at the same time as E.M. Forster was penning cautionary lines about a business sector which sees “life more steadily, though with the steadiness of the half-closed eye” (Forster, 1995, p. 434) and which encapsulates a seemingly inevitable double standard:

I complain about the quality of his sultanas and he answers in one breath that they are the best sultanas and how can I expect the best sultanas at that price? (Forster, 1995, p. 245).

Shrewd observations that nearly a century later provided Naomi Klein with so much material and justified Joel Bakan’s damning diagnosis of the psychopathology of the corporation.

Wilkie and Moore’s (2003) review goes on to conclude that this interest in the social impact of marketing needs to continue and indeed strengthen, a call which echoed sentiments in the *Journal of Marketing*’s millennium edition emphasising the need to reenergise the issue of marketing and society regretting that “it is clear that this was once the case, but is not the case today” (Lusch, 1999). Post-credit crunch the call has been renewed but is seemingly falling on deaf ears, with *The Economist* welcoming recognition by business school deans that they were partly to blame for the economic meltdown, but regretting their pusillanimous and largely rhetorical response: “the giants of management education have laboured mightily to bring forth a molehill” (*op cit*).

The *BJM* (Currie *et al.*, 2010) is equally critical, if somewhat more measured in tone, and is, for instance, inclined to question whether Adaire Turner’s stark assessment of “a fundamental intellectual failure” prior to the credit crisis can be laid at our door. But given that, we are society’s business intellectuals, it is difficult to evade the blame. Currie *et al.* (2010) go on to call on business schools to “become more reflexive in considering how to respond to economic events that may prove a tipping point in what the world expects of business schools and, indeed, business”.

SISM is positioning itself at this tipping point and is intent on doing some pushing. This, as we argued some years ago (Hastings and Saren, 2003), can be done by learning from the techniques of business and applying these outside the market place and to social rather than consumption behaviours. It can also be done by questioning and challenging current business models – from the depredations of big tobacco to the materialism and vacuity of the bonus culture. Thus, SISM will deploy a combination of intelligent poaching and rigorous gamekeeping so as to secure immediate impact. In the longer run, we will also explore fundamentally different models of business practice, research and teaching that are designed from the outset to suit the public interests in particular communities and societies. SISM will challenge the current realities for poachers and gamekeepers, questioning both the roots of accepted norms and the status quo.

Intelligent poaching

In essence, the great skill at the heart of marketing, which becomes turbo-charged in the hands of the corporation, is the capacity to understand people and thereby influence

their behaviour. Marketing can get us all to do things – visit the shops, attend messages, buy products and services, buy them again [. . .] and again. This power and its global potential is perhaps most apparent in the digital arena, where increasingly sophisticated interactive media make it possible to play with consumers sense of place, belonging and social context.

And it is clear that commercial marketing techniques can be used to push in different directions and encourage pro-health, pro-social and pro-planet behaviours rather than consumption. Just as marketers use careful research, strategic planning and the continuity of relational thinking, branding, co-production, along with a growing mastery of the digital sphere, to further their ends – so social marketers can use the same principles to encourage social and personally desirable behaviour. And there is good evidence that it works (Gordon *et al.*, 2006).

In *Nudge*, Thaler and Sunstein (2009) demonstrate how just one aspect of marketing – product positioning at point of sale – can be transferred from the shop to the school canteen with direct beneficial impacts on pupil diets. When carrots got the equivalent of end of isle slot, they were easily able to outperform chips. The authors go on to give many different examples of how adjustments to our social context – which marketers address habitually with environmental scanning and situation analysis – can have a marked impact on individual behaviour. Similarly, Lowry *et al.* (2004) applied basic customer service principles to enhance the cessation efforts of health visitors in the north east of England. He used ethnographic research to inform role play that enabled the professionals to see how their customers perceived them – and then adjust their performance accordingly. The result was a dramatic increase in custom for the cessation services – and in successful quitting.

On a grander scale, an anti-smoking campaign across the USA used communications and public engagement to develop a powerful brand called simply “Truth”. The advertising was completely uncompromising, highlighting the unscrupulous business practices of the tobacco companies, and specifically their deliberate attempts to attract youngsters to the habit. One advertisement, for instance, showed 100 of (full) body bags being delivered to tobacco corporation headquarters to represent the numbers killed by smoking, and another the ambushing of executives with embarrassing questions about their seeming predilection for killing people. The result was a very high profile campaign which worked: it brought about a marked reduction in youth smoking rates (Farrelly *et al.*, 2002).

Now think about the potential of bringing all these elements together – environmental scanning, customer service and branding, along with other business constructs like strategic planning, co-production and stakeholder marketing – and the potential of social marketing becomes palpable.

Nonetheless, poaching, however, intelligent is only ever going to be part of the solution. On its own, it suffers from a number of limitations. First, it is too little too late. The tobacco industry kills one in two of its long-term customers. That translates to 600,000 people every year in the EU alone. Across the world, deaths from tobacco have now reached six million a year and counting – World Health Organisation (WHO) estimates suggest the figure will reach eight million deaths by 2030. Great strides with tobacco control in a few countries – Western Australia, for instance, has reduced teen smoking to 4.8 per cent – are simply being overwhelmed by a global tobacco industry that is addicting third world children with the rapacity of a new plague. The ultimate

indicator of the limitations of focusing purely on individual behaviour change is that tobacco stock continues to be one of the safest and most profitable investments there is. To tobacco, add the two other marketing-driven pandemics: alcohol and obesity – which are also both in the WHO's top ten list of preventable killers (WHO, 2009). And time and again, it is the poor that bear the brunt of this behavioural catastrophe (WHO, 2009; Marmot, 2006); so across the developed world – and increasingly in the developing one – inequalities in life expectancy are being driven by commercial marketing despite public health attempts to push in the other direction.

Second, this is David and Goliath territory: the alcohol industry, for instance, spends an estimated €800 million a year promoting its products in the UK alone and the vast majority of food advertising is for foods high in fat, salt and sugar. Public health efforts are consequently vastly out-gunned. Looking ahead, digital marketing will continue this disparity in favour of commerce. It is an expensive and risky field of endeavour, involving extensive data mining and bold experimentation, and requiring big and flexible budgets. The obvious danger, especially at a time of public austerity, is that this will become an exclusive and private club, with carrots being moved and effects being measured away from the public gaze – and great opportunities being lost in the process.

Third, prevention, as has been so often said, is much better (and more efficient) than cure. It makes much more sense to stop the tobacco, food and alcohol corporations doing their damage in the first place, than trying to apply sticking plasters after the event.

Finally, successful corporate marketers themselves move way beyond the individual consumer to ensure success: politicians, legislators, opinion leaders and competitors all fall within their purview. The UK food industry, for example, through its lobbying group, the Food and Drink Federation, was found to have over 2,000 contacts with ministers, MPs, lords, MEPs, MSPs and special advisers in 2004 just as the obesity epidemic was taking off and regulatory responses were being considered (*The Guardian*, 2004). And earlier this year, the same industry operating at an EU level spent an estimated one billion € to stop traffic light on-pack labelling (The Ecologist, 2010).

So, inevitably, we must also turn to gamekeeping.

Rigorous gamekeeping

The Victorians recognised consumption as a killer; belatedly, we are now doing the same. Our ancestors, of course, were anxious about tuberculosis (TB), which, once identified, was immediately recognised as a scourge: no one needed to be convinced that TB was a bad thing and the task of motivating people to avoid it was relatively straight forward. Responding to TB was also a unified purpose; all sections of society – public, private and voluntary – were involved. The challenge then was not whether to act, but what action to take. Initial attempts based on inadequate understanding of the aetiology of the disease were largely unsuccessful. However, scientific advances which isolated the cause – the disease vector – and then a means of either preventing it from infecting people in the first place, or reducing its rapacity, brought about massive reductions in the illness and its symptoms. The battle is not over: in developing countries, the poor continue to be ravaged by TB, and drug resistant strains of the bacillus saw over 6,000 cases in the UK last year. But the former is largely a function of economics and the latter compares favourably with an estimated one in four deaths from TB in nineteenth century Britain. The Victorians' dangerous form of consumption may not have been defeated, but it has been successfully and consistently combated.

In contrast, our dangerous form of consumption – both of individually harmful products and of all products to excess – is proving more resistant. We have taken the first step and recognised that there is a problem; like the Victorians, we have spotted our adversary. Indeed, we have the advantage on them in that we have also isolated the bug – an over-enthusiasm for “stuff” – and the steps to stop it spreading are clear: we just need to avoid spending our hard-earned money on harmful products, and reduce our expenditure on everything. In fact, we do not actually have to do anything – just stop doing something: shopping. And yet we are failing.

Why so? How come the Victorians could take on and challenge the completely unknown, but we cannot even lay a glove on the known? The short answer is vested interest. The TB bacillus, nasty though it is, does not have armies of bright, energetic and well-trained MBAs on its side. It cannot marshal massive advertising budgets, buttress itself with evocative brands or invite senior politicians out for games of golf. It has not brought these powers to their apotheosis in the form of the corporation. It is, in short, no good at marketing.

The solution, as with TB, has to be to address the disease vector. We have to understand and limit its effectiveness. But here, the metaphor breaks down. With TB, the goal is simple eradication; with marketing, it is containment and conversion. There is no upside to the TB bacillus, but corporate business can create wealth, provide us with taxes and incentivise innovation. We do not need the death penalty to have an immediate impact, but an enlightened and restorative criminal justice system. Marketing and business has to be subject to scrutiny, criticism and regulation. Only then can we avoid what Forster called “the inner darkness in high places that comes with a commercial age” (*op cit*, p. 446).

In other words, there is an immediate need to build an evidence base upon, which decisions can be made about the functioning of the market place and, in Wilkie and Moore (2003) words, to facilitate its “maximal operations for the benefit of the host society”. SISM is doing this using both primary and secondary research. For example, our International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project (<http://itcproject.org>) is a longitudinal research programme designed to assess the impact of different tobacco control policy options such as advertising bans, on-pack warnings and price increases. It uses a multi-country design – originally four countries were involved (the UK, the USA, Canada and Australia) but that has now been extended to two dozen – and natural experiments to track policy impact. For instance, it has been possible to show how the ban on tobacco advertising in the UK has resulted in significant public health gains that are not evident in the USA, where no such ban has been enacted (Harris *et al.*, 2006).

An alternative approach to building the evidence base is to analyse secondary research, which presents particular challenges because of the degree of contention involved. The medical community, which also has to make challenging, consensual decisions about a contested evidence base, has responded by developing the concept of “evidence-based decision making” (Mulrow, 1994). This is built around the systematic review (SR) (Boaz *et al.*, 2002), which strengthens traditional literature reviewing by making it comprehensive, rigorous and transparent. The process starts by laying down: a clear protocol for searching all relevant database; the content and quality criteria that will be used to determine inclusion in the review; the methods used to assess the relative quality of the included studies and their synthesis into conclusions. The contents of this protocol are included in the completed review and can therefore be subjected to detailed scrutiny and, if necessary, replicated by other researchers.

A few years ago, we conducted the first ever SR on the impact that food promotion may or may not be having on childhood obesity. The field is immensely contested and the review was the subject of much challenge, particularly from the food and advertising industries. However, the transparency about the methods used meant that critics had to point out precise flaws or omissions; blanket disagreement or dismissal was untenable. Indeed, the review procedures could be repeated and thoroughly checked, as they were by Ofcom. This resulted in the UK government accepting the core review finding – that advertising (among many other factors) is implicated in childhood obesity – and introducing restrictions around children’s programming accordingly.

But it is also important to appreciate that regulation, like individual behaviour change, will not work on its own. It needs a popular mandate. In Scotland, the move to smoke-free public places is a powerful illustration of this. This was a dramatic and counter-intuitive piece of legislation – a no-smoking Gallowgate pub had all the plausibility of a silent rock concert; and yet it happened and was welcomed. Despite dire headlines on the weekend before, the new rules came into force, predicting public riots and civil disobedience, the reality was wide public acceptance. Indeed, the Smoke-free Act was probably the single most popular achievement of the McConnell government. Why so? Because the Scottish public was convinced of the benefits of the move and rejoiced in Scotland taking such an improbable public health lead (and besting England in the process). Shortly after the legislation was introduced, a public opinion poll showed that no fewer than 84 per cent of young Scots felt it was a move “that Scotland could be proud of” – praise indeed in such a nationalistic country.

So the regulation and editing of our social context has to go hand in hand with the winning of our hearts and minds – and the two strands of critical analysis come together.

Rebuilding trust

As Michael Thomas points out, however, none of this can work without the crucial ingredient of trust:

“[...] to win public trust for innovation we need to establish a transparent publicly accountable system of trusted expert third parties who will assess risk on our behalf” [...] “we need to improve procedures to make sure that injured parties can have redress and appeal to arbitration and an independent review” (*op cit*, p. 8).

And, as his words also confirm, trust requires both real and perceived independence. His views carry even greater resonance following the credit crisis and the public bail-out of the banks which, across Europe, is linked directly to savage cuts in public spending and real harm to living standards of ordinary people. At a time, when it is all too apparent that the rich and powerful are getting the pleasure and the poor the blame, trust is going to be at a premium – and independent critical scrutiny and regulation even more necessary than when Michael was writing.

The UK’s response to the public health challenges of alcohol and tobacco present instructive illustrations of both good and bad practices. First, the bad, alcohol consumption has increased dramatically in the last two decades, and along with it alcohol-related harm. Cirrhosis, personal injury, public disorder and unwanted sexual encounters have all mushroomed. No one knows what the long-term effects will be on a younger generation of both men and women who are drinking far more than their parents and grandparents did. Department of Health figures suggest that nearly

three quarters of alcohol is drunk at hazardous or harmful levels (House of Commons Health Committee, 2010).

Thus, from society's perspective, our collective health and well-being would be best served by a massive decrease in *per capita* consumption. A combination of policies could be introduced to achieve this, including minimum pricing, marketing restrictions and limitations on the number of licenses. All have a good evidence base to support them. By contrast business as usual, ameliorated by public education is likely to have little impact. The reality? No minimum pricing; no marketing restrictions; a proliferation of licenses and public education, funded by the drinks industry, in the form of the Drinkaware Trust – whose blatant lack of independence will, despite the name, prevent it ever generating any trust.

This is not to suggest that the drinks industry, whilst obviously part of the UK's drink problem, cannot be part of the solution. But, as the WHO recommends, its role should be limited to its core skills: the production, distribution and sale of alcohol – and how these can be made less harmful. Public health should be left to the public health experts and if the drinks industry has resources to spare for initiatives like DAT this should be taken as a legitimate levy, not accepted as a donation.

Tobacco has been a very different story. Public health has proceeded independently of industry influence so individual behaviour change has been facilitated and encouraged at the same time as norms and social context have been adjusted. Thus, public education and professional cessation services have been combined with severe limitations on tobacco marketing, mandatory health warnings on every pack, steep price increases and the tightening regulation at point of sale. The result has been a steady and reassuring decline in smoking prevalence.

Independence and transparency are, therefore, vital qualities in our attempts to bring about a more benign business system and progressive social sector. They ground our critical vision.

A critical vision

Thank you then, Michael Thomson, for pointing out the elephant in the business school classroom ten years before the Lehman Brothers forced us to pay attention. Thank you also for showing that the way forward includes critical and independent scrutiny of the business process that will both constrain its worst excesses and borrow its most effective tools.

Now rest easily, SISM is taking up the challenge.

References

- Boaz, A., Ashby, D. and Young, K. (2002), "Systematic reviews: what have they got to offer evidence based policy and practice?", Working Paper No. 2, ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Queen Mary, University of London, London.
- Currie, G., Knights, D. and Starkey, K. (2010), "Introduction: a post-crisis critical reflection on business schools", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, pp. S1-S5.
- (The) *Ecologist* (2010), available at: www.theecologist.org/News/news_round_up/511976/industry_lobbying_sees_eu_reject_traffic_light_food_labelling.html
- Farrelly, M.C., Heaton, C.G., Davis, K.C., Messeri, P., Hersey, J.C. and Haviland, M.L. (2002), "Getting to the truth: evaluating national tobacco counter marketing campaigns", *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 92 No. 6, pp. 901-7.

- Forster, E.M. (1995), *Howards End*, Bath Press, Bath.
- Gordon, R., McDermott, L., Stead, M. and Angus, K. (2006), "The effectiveness of social marketing interventions for health improvement: what's the evidence", *Public Health*, Vol. 120 No. 12, pp. 1133-9.
- (The) *Guardian* (2004), available at: www.guardian.co.uk/society/2004/may/26/medicineandhealth.politics
- Harris, F., MacKintosh, A.M., Anderson, S., Hastings, G., Borland, R., Fong, G.T., Hammond, D., Cummings, K.M. and for the ITC Collaboration (2006), "Effects of the 2003 advertising/promotion ban in the United Kingdom on awareness of tobacco marketing: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) four country survey", *Tobacco Control*, Vol. 15, pp. iii26-iii33 (supplement 3).
- Hastings, G.B. and Soren, M. (2003), "The critical contribution of social marketing: theory and application", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 305-22.
- House of Commons Health Committee (2010), Alcohol: First Report of Session 2009-10 Volume I (HC 151-I), The Stationery Office Limited, London, available at: www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/200910/cmselect/cmhealth/151/151i.pdf (accessed 5 October 2010).
- Lowry, R.J., Hardy, S., Jordan, C. and Wayman, G. (2004), "Using social marketing to increase recruitment of pregnant smokers to smoking cessation service: a success story", *Public Health*, Vol. 118, pp. 239-43.
- Lusch, R. (1999), "From the editor", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63 Nos 1/2, pp. 14-18 (special issue).
- Marmot, M. (2006), "Health in an unequal world", *The Lancet*, Vol. 368 No. 9552, pp. 2081-94.
- Mulrow, C.D. (1994), "Systematic reviews – rationale for systematic reviews 1", *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 309 No. 6954, pp. 597-9.
- Schumpeter (2009), "The Pedagogy of the Privileged", *The Economist US Edition*, September 26.
- Thaler, R. and Sunstein, C. (2009), *Nudge Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, Penguin, London.
- Thomas, M.J. (1999), "Thoughts on building a just and stake holding society", paper presented at 20th Anniversary Conference, Alliance of Universities for Democracy, Budapest (Hungary), 7 November.
- WHO (2009), "Global health risks: mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks", World Health Organisation, Geneva, available at: www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (accessed 5 October 2010).
- Wilkie, W.L. and Moore, E.S. (2003), "Scholarly research in marketing: exploring the 'Four Eras' of thought development", *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 116-46.

Further reading

- Stead, M., McDermott, L., Gordon, R., Angus, K. and Hastings, G. (2006), *A Review of the Effectiveness of Social Marketing Alcohol, Tobacco & Substance Misuse Interventions. Prepared for the National Social Marketing Centre*, Institute for Social Marketing, University of Stirling & The Open University, Stirling, available at: www.nsms.org.uk/images/CoreFiles/NSMC-R3_alcohol_tobacco_substance.pdf

Corresponding author

Gerard Hastings can be contacted at: Gerard.hastings@stir.ac.uk

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: reprints@emeraldinsight.com
Or visit our web site for further details: www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints